

OXFORD

ΜΕΛΕΤΟΥ *
 ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΔΩΡ.
 ΔΙΑ ΤΟΝ ΤΡΑΥΤ
 ΕΡΩΤΑ ΠΡΟΣ

ἀγαθόν
ἐχόμενον
παρῶν τῶν
πρῶτων ἐν ἡμῖν

ΠΑΥΛΟΣ
ΑΝΤΙΦΙΟΥ
ὅτι χρυσῶν
τῶν ἐκ τῆς

Edited by

Maria Kanellou, Ivana Petrovic, and Chris Carey

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

GREEK EPIGRAM FROM THE HELLENISTIC
TO THE EARLY BYZANTINE ERA

Greek Epigram from the Hellenistic to the Early Byzantine Era

Edited by
MARIA KANELLOU, IVANA PETROVIC,
AND CHRIS CAREY

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2019

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2019

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018955535

ISBN 978-0-19-883682-7

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following institutes for their generous support of the international conference from which this project originates: UCL (FIGS Funding and A. G. Leventis Fund), the SPHS, and the ICS. Our warm thanks go also to Oxford University Press and the two anonymous readers who supported this project and, last but not least, to Dr Dimitrios Stamatis for his assistance with the bibliography and to Mr Adam Gross, graduate student at the University of Virginia, for his editorial assistance and the indexing of the volume.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	ix
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xix

1. Introduction	1
<i>Maria Kanellou, Ivana Petrovic, and Chris Carey</i>	

Part 1: Encountering Epigram

2. Reading Inscriptions in Literary Epigram	19
<i>Joseph Day</i>	
3. Lessons in Reading and Ideology: On Greek Epigrams in Private Compilations of the Hellenistic Age	35
<i>Andrej Petrovic</i>	
4. A Garland of Freshly Grown Flowers: The Poetics of Editing in Philip's <i>Stephanos</i>	51
<i>Regina Höschele</i>	
5. Epigrams on Authors and Books as Text and Paratext	66
<i>Kristoffel Demoen</i>	

Part 2: Imitation, Variation, Interaction

6. Miniaturization of Earlier Poetry in Greek Epigrams	85
<i>Annette Harder</i>	
7. Variations on Simplicity: Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum in Philip's <i>Garland</i>	102
<i>Charles S. Campbell</i>	
8. The Riddles of the Fourteenth Book of the <i>Palatine Anthology</i> : Hellenistic, Later Imperial, Early Byzantine, or Something More?	119
<i>Simone Beta</i>	

Part 3: Writing Death

9. Death of a Child: Grief Beyond the Literary?	137
<i>Richard Hunter</i>	

10. Hellenistic and Roman Military Epitaphs on Stone and on Papyrus: Questions of Authorship and Literariness <i>Silvia Barbantani</i>	154
11. Tears and Emotions in Greek Literary Epitaphs <i>Doris Meyer</i>	176
12. Sea and Land: Dividing Sepulchral Epigram <i>Michael A. Tueller</i>	192
Part 4: Gods, Religion, and Cult	
13. Epigrammatic Variations/Debate on the Theme of Cybele's Music <i>Marco Fantuzzi</i>	213
14. Dreadful Eros, before and after Meleager <i>Kathryn Gutzwiller</i>	233
Part 5: Praise and Blame	
15. Mythological Burlesque and Satire in Greek Epigram—A Case Study: Zeus' Seduction of Danae <i>Maria Kanellou</i>	249
16. Epigrams on the Persian Wars: An Example of Poetic Propaganda <i>Federica Giommoni</i>	272
17. 'From atop a lofty wall . . .': Philosophers and Philosophy in Greek Literary Epigram <i>Joseph M. Romero</i>	288
Part 6: Words and Images	
18. Greek Skoptic Epigram, Ecphrasis, and the Visual Arts <i>Lucia Floridi</i>	307
19. Ecphrasis and Iconoclasm: Palladas' Epigrams on Statues <i>Peter Bing</i>	324
20. Art, Nature, Power: Garden Epigrams from Nero to Heraclius <i>Steven D. Smith</i>	339
<i>Bibliography</i>	355
<i>General Index</i>	397
<i>Index Locorum</i>	410
<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>	431
<i>Anthologia Planudea</i>	439

List of Figures

- 18.1 *The Thorn-Puller (Spinario Capitolino)*, Inv. MC 1186/S—Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, Sala dei Trionfi. Archivio Fotografico dei Musei Capitolini, Rome/photograph by Zeno Colantoni. 313
© Roma, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali—Musei Capitolini.
- 18.2 Grotesque as the Thorn-Puller, Louvre, Paris, fourth/third century BCE. 315
Photo © RMN-Grand Palais (Musée du Louvre)/photograph by Hervé Lewandowski.
- 18.3 Terracotta, Priene, second century BCE. Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz. 316
TC 8626 © Johannes Laurentius/SMB Antikensammlung.
- 18.4 The *Colonna Venus* in the Museo Pio-Clementino belongs to the collections of the Vatican Museums. It is probably the most faithful replica of the lost Cnidian Aphrodite. 321
Photo © Musei Vaticani.
- 18.5 *Aphrodite Anadyomene*, Pompeian mural from the House of Venus in the Shell. 322
© Archivio fotografico Pompei, courtesy of the Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo—Soprintendenza Pompei. This picture cannot be reproduced or copied in any form.

List of Abbreviations

The following list contains the abbreviations used in this volume, including those of editions of original texts. The principal editions of epigrams are abbreviated A–B, *FGE*, *GPh*, and *HE* in references to epigrams, but follow the Harvard system (author–date) in regular citations (usually in notes). The abbreviations of Greek titles follow the *Greek-English Lexicon* edited by Liddell, Scott, and Jones (*LSJ*) and, wherever this is not possible, the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (*OCD*). In the few cases where an author’s name features in the *LSJ* abbreviations but a title of his is abbreviated only in the *OCD*, we combine the abbreviations from these two sources. Latin titles follow the *OCD*. The abbreviations for the names of the journals that appear in the Bibliography follow *L’Année philologique*.

A–B	Austin, C. and Bastianini, G. (eds) (2002), <i>Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia</i> , Milan
Adler	Adler, A. (ed.) (1967–71), <i>Suidae Lexicon</i> , 5 vols, Stuttgart (1st edn 1928–38, Leipzig)
AE	<i>L’Année épigraphique</i> (1888–), Paris
AP	<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>
APL	<i>Anthologia Planudea</i>
Arrighetti	Arrighetti, G. (ed.) (1960), <i>Epicuro: Opere</i> (Classici della Filosofia 4), Turin (2nd edn 1973)
Astbury	Astbury, R. (ed.) (1985), <i>M. Terentii Varronis Saturarum Menippearum fragmenta</i> , Leipzig
Barrett	Barrett, W. S. (ed.) (1964), <i>Euripides: Hippolitos</i> , Oxford
Beckby	Beckby, H. (ed.) (1957–8), <i>Anthologia Graeca</i> , 4 vols, Munich (2nd edn 1965 (vols 1–2) and 1968 (vols 3–4))
Berger	Berger, A. (ed., trans.) (2013), <i>Accounts of Medieval Constantinople: The Patria</i> (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 24), Cambridge, MA
B–G	Bastianini, G. and Gallazzi, C., in collaboration with Austin, C. (eds) (2001), <i>Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi</i> (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309) (Papiri dell’Università degli Studi di Milano 8), Milan
Bidez	Bidez, J. (ed.) (1960), <i>L’Empereur Julien: Oeuvres complètes</i> , vol. 1.2, Paris (1st edn 1924)
Billerbeck	Billerbeck, M. (ed.) (2006), <i>Stephani Byzantii Ethnica I: A–I</i> (Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae 43.1), Berlin
BKT	<i>Berliner Klassikertexte</i> (1904–), Berlin (available with updated bibliography at http://ww2.smb.museum/berlpap/index.php/bkt-i)

- Boissonade J. F. (ed.) (1831), *Ἀνέκδοτα: Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis*, vol. 3, Paris, 429–55
- Brunck R. F. P. (ed.) (1772–6), *Analecta veterum poetarum Graecorum*, 3 vols, Strasbourg
- Budé Waltz, P. et al. (eds) (1928–), *Anthologie grecque*, Paris
- Busse A. (ed.) (1900), *Eliae in Porphyrii Isagogen et Aristotelis Categorias commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 18.1), Berlin
- CA Powell, J. U. (ed.) (1925), *Collectanea Alexandrina: Reliquiae minores poetarum Graecorum aetatis Ptolemaicae, 323–146 A.C.: Epicorum, elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum*, Oxford (repr. 1981, Chicago)
- Cameron/Herrin Cameron, A. M. and Herrin, J., in conjunction with Cameron, A., Cormack, R., and Roueché, C. (eds) (1984), *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: The Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 10), Leiden
- CEG Hansen, P. A. (ed.) (1983–9), *Carmina epigraphica Graeca*, 2 vols (Texte und Kommentare 12 and 15), Berlin
- CGFP Austin, C. (ed.) (1973), *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*, Berlin
- CIG Boeckh, A. (ed.) (1828–77), *Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum*, 4 vols, Berlin
- CIL *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum: Consilio et auctoritate Academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum* (1863–), Berlin
- Cougny Cougny, E. (ed.) (1890), *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum*, 3 vols, Paris
- CPP *Catalogue of Paraliterary Papyri*, compiled by M. Huys et al., available online at <http://cpp.arts.kuleuven.be>
- Diehl Diehl, E. (ed.) (1925), *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*, 2 vols, Leipzig (2nd edn 1942; 3rd edn 1949–52)
- D–K Diels, H. and Kranz, W. (eds) (1952), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 3 vols, 6th edn, Berlin (1st edn 1903)
- Dindorf Dindorf, L. (ed.) (1832), *Chronicon paschale*, 2 vols, Bonn
- EG Kaibel, G., (ed.) (1878), *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin
- FD *Fouilles de Delphes*:
 III 3.2 = Daux, G. (ed.) (1943), *Inscriptions depuis le trésor des Athéniens jusqu'aux bases de Gélon*, Paris
 III 4 = Colin, G. (ed.) (1930), *Inscriptions de la terrasse du temple et de la région nord du sanctuaire*, Paris; 2nd edn Flacelière, R. (ed.) (1954), nos 87–275, Paris

- Fernández-Galiano Fernández-Galiano, E. (ed.) (1987), *Posidipo de Pela* (Manuales y anejos de 'Emerita' 36), Madrid
- FGE Page, D. L. (ed.) (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams: Epigrams before AD 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources, Not Included in Hellenistic Epigrams or The Garland of Philip*, Cambridge
- FGrHist Jacoby, F. (ed.) (1923–58), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin
- Fl^a Floridi, L. (ed.) (2007), *Stratone di Sardi: Epigrammi: Testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Hellenica 24), Alessandria
- Fl^b Floridi, L. (ed.) (2014), *Lucillio: Epigrammi: Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Texte und Kommentare 47), Berlin
- Foerster/Richtsteig Foerster, R. and Richtsteig, E. (eds) (1972), *Choricii Gazaei opera*, Stuttgart (repr. of 1929 edn, Leipzig)
- Förster Förster, R. (ed.) (1903–27), *Libanii opera*, 12 vols, Leipzig
- GE Geffcken, J. (ed.) (1916), *Griechische Epigramme* (Kommentierte griechische und lateinische Texte 3), Heidelberg
- GG Peek, W. (ed.) (1960), *Griechische Grabgedichte* (Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt 7), Berlin
- GLP Page, D. L. (ed., trans.) (1941–2), *Greek Literary Papyri* (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge, MA
- GPh Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. (eds) (1968), *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, 2 vols, Cambridge
- Green Green, R. P. H. (ed.) (1991), *The Works of Ausonius*, Oxford
- Guéraud/Jouguet Guéraud, O. and Jouguet, P. (eds) (1938), *Un livre d'écolier du III^e siècle avant J.-C.* (Publications de la société royale égyptienne de papyrologie: Textes et documents 2), Cairo
- GV Peek, W. (ed.) (1955), *Griechische Vers-Inschriften I: Grab-Epigramme*, Berlin
- Harder Harder, M. A. (ed.) (2012), *Callimachus: Aetia*, 2 vols, Oxford
- Haury Haury, J. (ed.) (1962–4), *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*, 4 vols, Leipzig
- HE Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. (eds) (1965), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols, Cambridge
- Hollis Hollis, A. S. (ed.) (2009), *Callimachus: Hecale*, Oxford (1st edn 1990)
- I. Délos *Inscriptions de Délos* (1926–), Paris
- IG *Inscriptiones Graecae* (1873–), Berlin
- IGLS Sartre-Fauriat, A. and Sartre M. (eds) (2014), *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie XV: Le plateau du Trachôn et ses*

- bordures*, 2 vols (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 204), Beyrouth
- IGUR Moretti, L. (ed.) (1968–90), *Inscriptiones Graecae urbis Romae*, 4 vols, Rome
- IK *Inchriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* (1972–), Bonn
- IK Estremo oriente Canali de Rossi, F. (ed.) (2004), *Iscrizioni dello estremo oriente greco: Un repertorio* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 65), Bonn
- IK Klaudiupolis Becker-Bertau, F. (ed.) (1986), *Die Inschriften von Klaudiupolis*, (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 31), Bonn
- ILS Dessau, H. (ed.) (1892–1916), *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, 3 vols, Berlin
- Irigoin Irigoin, J., Duchemin, J., and Bardollet, L. (eds) (1993), *Bacchylide: Dithyrambes, épinicies, fragments*, Paris
- ISE Moretti, L. (ed.) (1967), *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche I: Attica, Peloponneso, Beozia* (Biblioteca di studi superiori: Storia antica ed epigrafia 53), Florence
- Jacobs Jacobs, F. (ed.) (1794–1814), *Anthologia Graeca sive poetarum Graecorum lusus ex recensione Brunckii: Indices et commentarium*, 13 vols, Leipzig
- Jaeckel Jaeckel, S. (ed.) (1964), *Menandri Sententiae: Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis*, Leipzig
- K–A (PCG) Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (eds) (1983–2001), *Poetae comici Graeci*, 8 vols, Berlin
- KILyk. Laminger-Pascher, G. (ed.) (1992), *Die kaiserzeitlichen Inschriften Lykaoniens I: Der Süden* (DAW 232: Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris 15), Vienna
- Kühn Kühn, C. G. (ed.) (1821–33), *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, 20 vols (Medicorum Graecorum opera quae exstant), Leipzig (repr. 1964–5, Hildesheim; vol. 18.1 orig. published 1829)
- LGNP Fraser P. M., Matthews, E., Osborne M. J., Byrne S. G., and Corsten T. (eds) (1988–2010), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, 6 vols, Oxford
- Lightfoot Lightfoot, J. L. (ed., trans.) (2009), *Hellenistic Collection: Philotas, Alexander of Aetolia, Hermesianax, Euphoriion, Parthenius* (Loeb Classical Library 508), Cambridge, MA
- LIMC Boardman, J. et al. (eds) (1981–99), *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, 8 vols and 2 indices, Zurich
- Livrea Livrea, E. (ed.) (1979), *Pamphrepii Panopolitani carmina* (P. Gr. Vindob. 29788 A–C), Leipzig
- L–P Lobel, E. and Page, D. (eds) (1955), *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*, Oxford

- LSJ* Liddell, H. G. and Scott, R., rev. Jones, H. S. et al. (eds) (1996), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, repr. of the 9th edn, Oxford (1st edn 1843)
- Madden Madden, J. A. (ed.) (1995), *Macedonius Consul: The Epigrams* (Spudasmata 60), Hildesheim
- Massimilla Massimilla, G. (ed.) (1996), *Callimaco: Aitia: Libri primo e secondo* (Biblioteca di studi antichi 77), Pisa
- M–W Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L. (eds) (1967), *Fragmenta Hesioidea*, Oxford
- Mette Mette, H. J. (1980), 'Neoptolemus von Parion', *RhM* 123, 1–24
- Milovanović Milovanović, Č. (ed.) (1986), *Βυζαντινὰ αἰνίγματα: Vizantijske zagonetke*, Belgrade
- Nauck Nauck, A. (ed.) (1889), *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Leipzig
- Nauck² Nauck, A. (ed.) (1964), 2nd edn of his *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, with a supplement by B. Snell, Hildesheim
- New Palladas* Wilkinson, K. W. (ed.) (2012), *New Epigrams of Palladas: A Fragmentary Papyrus Codex (P. CtYBR inv. 4000)* (American Studies in Papyrology 52), Durham, NC
- Obbink Obbink, D. (ed.) (1996), *Philodemus: On Piety, Part 1: Critical Text with Commentary*, Oxford
- OCD Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A., and Eidinow, E. (eds) (2012), *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edn, Oxford (1st edn 1949)
- OGIS Dittenberger, W. (ed.) (1903–5), *Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae: Supplementum sylloges inscriptionum Graecarum*, 2 vols, Leipzig (repr. 1960, Hildesheim)
- P *Codex Palatinus*: Heidelberg, *Cod. Gr.* 23 and Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, *Cod. Gr. Suppl.* 384
- Paton Paton, W. R. (ed., trans.) (1916–18), *The Greek Anthology*, 5 vols (Loeb Classical Library 67, 68, 84–6), London (several reprints)
- Pertusi Pertusi, A. (ed.) (1959), *Giorgio di Pisidia: Poemi I: Panegirici epici*, Ettal
- Pf. Pfeiffer, R. (ed.) (1949–53), *Callimachus*, vol. 1: *Fragmenta*, vol. 2: *Hymni et epigrammata*, Oxford
- PG Migne, J.-P. (ed.) (1857–66), *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca*, 161 vols, Paris
- Pl *Cod. Ven. Marc.* 481
- PMG Page, D. L. (ed.) (1962), *Poeti melici Graeci: Alcmanis, Stesichori, Ibyci, Anacreontis, Simonidis, Corinnae, poetarum minorum reliquias, carmina popularia et convivialia quaeque adespota feruntur*, Oxford (repr. 1967)
- PMGF Davies, M. (ed.) (1991), *Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta I: Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus*, Oxford

Pordomingo	Pordomingo, F. (ed.) (2013), <i>Antologías de época helenística en papiro</i> (Papyrologica Florentina 43), Florence
<i>P. Oxy.</i>	<i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> (1898–), London
Rabe ^a	Rabe, H. (ed.) (1913), <i>Hermogenis opera</i> (Rhetores Graeci VI), Leipzig
Rabe ^b	Rabe, H. (ed.) (1926), <i>Aphthonii progymnasmata</i> (Rhetores Graeci X), Leipzig
RE	Pauly, A., Wissowa, G., and Kroll, W. (eds) (1893–1980), <i>Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , Stuttgart (vol. 18.3 orig. published 1949)
Robert	Robert, L. (ed.) (1949), <i>Hellenica: Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques</i> , vol. 7, Paris
Rose	Rose, V. (ed.) (1886), <i>Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta</i> , Leipzig
Russell/Wilson	Russell, D. A. and Wilson, N. G. (eds) (1981), <i>Menander Rhetor</i> , Oxford
Schamp	Schamp, J. (ed.) (2006), <i>Jean le Lydien: Des magistratures de l'état romain</i> , vol. 1.1–2 (Collection des universités de France: Série grecque 450), Paris
SEG	<i>Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum</i> (1923–)
SGDI II	Bauer, A. and Collitz, H. (eds) (1885–99), <i>Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften II: Epirus, Akarnanien, Aetolien, Aenianen, Phthiotis, Lokris, Phokis, Dodona, Achaia und seine Colonien, Delphi</i> , Göttingen
SGO	Merkelbach, R. and Stauber, J. (eds) (1998–2004), <i>Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten</i> , 5 vols, Stuttgart
SH	Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P. (eds) (1983), <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> (Texte und Kommentare 11), Berlin
Spengel	Spengel, L. (ed.) (1854), <i>Rhetores Graeci</i> II, Leipzig
SSH	Lloyd-Jones, H. (ed.) (2005), <i>Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici</i> (Texte und Kommentare 26), Berlin
Stephens/Winkler	Stephens, S. A. and Winkler, J. J. (eds) (1995), <i>Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments</i> , Princeton, NJ
Sternbach	Sternbach, L. (ed.) (1900), 'Analecta avarica', <i>Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności: Wydział filologiczny</i> 2.15, 297–365
SVF	Von Armin, H. F. A. (ed.) (1903–24), <i>Stoicorum veterum fragmenta</i> , 4 vols, Leipzig (repr. 1964, Stuttgart)
TrGF	Snell, B., Kannicht, R., and Radt, S. (eds) (1977–2004), <i>Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta</i> , 5 vols, Göttingen
UPZ	Wilcken, U. (ed.) (1927), <i>Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde) I: Papyri aus Unterägypten</i> , Berlin

- V Voigt, E.-M. (ed.) (1971), *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta*, Amsterdam
- W West, M. L. (ed.) (1971–2), *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, 2 vols, Oxford (2nd edn 1989–92)
- Wehrli Wehrli, F. (ed.) (1967–9), *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentare*, 10 vols and 2 supplements, 2nd edn, Basel (1st edn 1944–59)
- Weil Weil, H. W. (ed.) (1879), *Un papyrus inédit de la bibliothèque de M. Ambroise Firmin-Didot: Nouveaux fragments d'Euripide et d'autres poètes grecs* (Monuments grecs publiés par l'association pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France 8), Paris
- West West, M. L. (ed., trans.) (2003), *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Loeb Classical Library 497), Cambridge, MA
- Westerink Westerink, L. G. (ed.) (1992), *Michaelis Pselli poemata*, Stuttgart
- Wimmer Wimmer, F. (ed.) (1854–62), *Theophrasti Eresii opera quae supersunt omnia*, 3 vols, Leipzig

List of Contributors

Silvia Barbantani is associate professor of classical philology and papyrology at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy.

Simone Beta is associate professor of classical philology at the University of Siena, Italy.

Peter Bing is professor of classics at the University of Toronto, Canada.

Charles S. Campbell is visiting assistant professor in the Department of Classics at Miami University in Ohio, USA.

Chris Carey is emeritus professor of Greek at University College London, UK.

Joseph Day is emeritus professor of classics at Wabash College, USA.

Kristoffel Demoen is professor of Greek literature at Ghent University, Belgium.

Marco Fantuzzi is professor of classics at the University of Roehampton, UK.

Lucia Floridi is senior assistant professor of classical philology in the Department of Classical Philology and Italian Studies at the University of Bologna, Italy.

Federica Giommoni is high school teacher in Arezzo, Italy and an independent researcher.

Kathryn Gutzwiller is professor of classics at the University of Cincinnati, USA.

Annette Harder is emerita professor of ancient Greek language and literature at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands.

Regina Hörschele is associate professor of classics at the University of Toronto, Canada.

Richard Hunter is Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Cambridge and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, UK.

Maria Kanellou is research fellow at the Academy of Athens, Greece.

Doris Meyer is research fellow in the joint research unit of the French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) and the University of Strasbourg, France (UMR 7044, 'Archeology and Ancient History: Mediterranean—Europe' (Archimède)).

Andrej Petrovic is professor of classics at the University of Virginia, USA.

Ivana Petrovic is Hugh H. Obear Professor of Classics at the University of Virginia, USA.

Joseph M. Romero is professor of classics at the University of Mary Washington, USA.

Steven D. Smith is professor of comparative literature, languages, and linguistics at Hofstra University, USA.

Michael A. Tueller is professor of classics at Arizona State University, USA.

Introduction

Maria Kanellou, Ivana Petrovic, and Chris Carey

1. INSCRIBED AND LITERARY EPIGRAM

Greek epigram is not only the briefest but also one of the most enduring and versatile poetic forms. The earliest extant inscribed epigrams date from the eighth century BCE, verse inscriptions forming a small section of the larger inscriptional canvas of the archaic and classical periods.¹ Epigrams, in the original sense of texts (in prose or verse) written or carved on a stone or another physical object,² are found on grave monuments, dedications, vases, and herms. They were used for a variety of public and semi-public purposes and could be found in all sorts of contexts, from major public memorials, such as the celebrated epigram for the Spartans who fell in the Battle of Thermopylae in 480 BCE,³ and family funereal inscriptions, which could be seen on tombs strung out along the high road leading out of any Greek city of note, through numerous dedications on statues, down to humble domestic objects visible in sanctuaries and public spaces across the Greek world. When epigram, during the Hellenistic era, ceased to be exclusively an inscribed text, its inscriptional form continued to perform all the tasks that it had always done: it accompanied dedications, statues, and other images, adorned public buildings and spaces, and figured on grave monuments, both public and private.

The earliest surviving inscribed epigrams were composed mainly in dactylic hexameters and less frequently in the iambic metre.⁴ From the latter part of the sixth century BCE onwards, however, the elegiac distich was widely used for

¹ See Bing and Bruss (2007b), 2–4.

² The word *epigramma* (as ‘inscription’) is first attested at Hdt. 5.59 and 7.228. Herodotus uses it to refer to the dedicatory inscription from the temple of Apollo at Thebes, in hexameter, and the *epitymbia* at Thermopylae, in elegiacs. On the term and the progressive expansion of its semantic field, see Bruss (2005), 1–18; cf. A. Petrovic (2007a), 50–1.

³ Hdt. 7.228: ‘Sim.’ AP 7.248 = FGE 22(a), AP 7.249 = FGE 22b, and AP 7.677 = FGE 6.

⁴ On the ‘rise and fall’ of iambics in verse inscriptions, see Kantzios (2005), 132–42.

verse inscriptions, and by the fourth century BCE it was established as the most popular epigrammatic metre.⁵ Inscribed epigrams of the archaic and classical periods rarely exceeded two couplets—naturally enough, since they were constrained by physical space. Brevity remained a dominant feature of literary epigram,⁶ and the challenge it presented to the skilled composer was to charge the words with the maximum amount of meaning.

The interpretation of inscribed epigrams on graves, monuments, or dedicatory objects is often aided by the objects themselves and their collocation. The connection between an inscribed epigram and the object on which it was written or incised not only gave epigram its name but also influenced its reception in both antiquity and the modern age.⁷ For decades, inscriptional epigrams were perceived by scholars as uninspired and of lesser value in comparison with those composed by famous poets of the Hellenistic era. Their brevity, role as conveyors of basic information, and usual lack of indication of author⁸ relegated them to the status of craft rather than art, and they were studied mainly as precursors to the literary epigram. Scholarly consensus was that only after epigram was ‘emancipated’ from its object and found its way into books did it become a ‘literary’ genre.⁹ Recently, though, a series of publications have questioned and subverted these assumptions, revealing the artistry of inscribed epigram, discussing it as a poetic form worthy of study in its own right, and broadening our knowledge of the cross-fertilization between inscribed epigram and its bookish counterpart. It goes without saying that Hansen’s two-volume edition (*CEG* 1983–9) of archaic and classical inscriptional epigrams from the eighth to the fourth century BCE, as well as Merkelbach and Stäuber’s multivolume edition (*SGO* 1998–2004) of inscriptional epigrams from the Greek East dating from the fourth century BCE to the seventh century CE propelled this renewed and intense study of the genre.¹⁰

⁵ Bowie (2010), 322 suggests that the rise and subsequent dominance of the elegiac couplet as the performative metre at symposia and festivals might have played a role in the establishment of elegiacs as the typical metre for the inscribed (and subsequently literary) epigram.

⁶ For the praise of *oligostichia*, see Phil. *AP* 4.2.6 = *GPh* 1.6; Parmen. *AP* 9.342.1–2 = *GPh* 11.1–2 (*φημι πολυστιχὴν ἐπιγράμματος οὐ κατὰ Μούσας | εἶναι*, ‘I say that an epigram of many lines does not agree with the Muses’); Cyrill. *AP* 9.369 = *FGE* p. 115. Martial (9.50 and 10.1) congratulates himself on the brevity of his epigrams. For *epigramma longum*, see Morelli (2008).

⁷ See e.g. Svenbro (1993), 62 and 164, who described the epigram as a machine designed to produce *kleos*.

⁸ The earliest verse inscriptions with poetic signatures date from the fourth century BCE, by Symmachus of Pellana (*CEG* 888.18–19) and Ion of Samos (*CEG* 819.5–6, 13). See Gutzwiller (1998), 48; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 289–91.

⁹ See e.g. Raubitschek (1968), 1–26.

¹⁰ Useful material is also included in earlier editions of inscribed epigrams: e.g. Kaibel (1878); Friedländer and Hoffleit (1948); Peek (1955; 1960). On dedicatory epigrams, see Kaczko (2016). For a useful list of earlier editions and specialized collections of epigrams, see Bing and Bruss (2007b), 19.

For instance, Joseph Day elucidated the sophisticated ways in which dedicatory epigram functions in unison with its object, attracting and guiding the passer-by's attention,¹¹ and argued that funerary inscriptions and grave markers allude to funerary rituals by employing the language of praise familiar from epic, elegiac, and encomiastic poetry.¹² Andrej Petrovic contributed to our appreciation of early inscribed epigram as 'high poetry' by showing that Simonides was perceived as the foundational figure of the genre, probably because he was one of the prominent poets entrusted with composing epigrams for public monuments; Petrovic further argued that Greek cities organized poetic competitions in order to decide to whom they would assign this prestigious task.¹³ Christos Tsagalis analysed the poetic techniques of fourth-century Attic funerary epigrams, pushing forward the study of the literary aspects of inscribed epitaphs;¹⁴ Eleonora Santin studied the corpus of verse inscriptions signed by poets, which is significantly larger than originally assumed;¹⁵ Valentina Garulli explored the ways in which the presentation of texts in papyrus rolls influenced the layout of inscriptions;¹⁶ Timo Christian, focusing on the 'speaker' of the monument, investigated the ways in which Hellenistic and later inscribed epigrams reacted to developments in their literary counterparts;¹⁷ Jon Bruss examined the creative reuse and refashioning of motifs and conventions drawn from inscribed sepulchral epigrams by the Hellenistic epigrammatists.¹⁸ In addition, a collective volume dedicated to the archaic and classical epigram and edited by Manuel Baumbach, Andrej Petrovic, and Ivana Petrovic (2010) discussed the subgenres of epigram,¹⁹ the epigrammatic voice,²⁰ early collections of epigrams,²¹ the relationship between inscriptional epigram and its object,²² and epigrammatic devices and features subsequently developed in Hellenistic book epigram.²³ Another recently published multicontributor volume, edited by Evina Sistakou and Antonios Rengakos (2016), explored the interrelated issues of the dialect, diction, and style of both literary and inscribed epigram.²⁴

¹¹ Day (1994; 2010).

¹² Day (1989; 2007) also argued that archaic and earlier classical inscriptional epigrams preserve 'a fossil of performance' (2007, 46). On the issue of whether or not inscriptions were read aloud, see also Bing (2002); Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 26–30; and compare Day's chapter in this volume.

¹³ A. Petrovic (2007b; 2009).

¹⁴ Tsagalis (2008).

¹⁵ Santin (2009). Cf. Santin and Tziafalias (2013).

¹⁶ Garulli (2012).

¹⁷ Christian (2015).

¹⁸ Bruss (2005).

¹⁹ Furley (2010); Trümper (2010); Wachter (2010); Schmitz (2010b).

²⁰ Schmitz (2010b); Tueller (2010); Vestrheim (2010); Wachter (2010).

²¹ Gutzwiller (2010a).

²² Borg (2010); Lorenz (2010).

²³ Bowie (2010); Bruss (2010a); Fantuzzi (2010); Hunter (2010).

²⁴ On the mutual influence between inscribed and literary epigram, see also the chapters by Barbantani, Day, and Hunter in this volume. For Julia Balbilla and her four Greek epigrams in Aeolic Greek inscribed on the famous Colossus of Memnon, see Cirio (2011); for an

The surge of interest in the literary aspects of inscribed epigram was initially sparked by the study of Hellenistic epigram and its early roots.²⁵ Early epigrammatic collections and the practice of quoting inscriptions and inscribed epigrams in literary texts provide precious insight into the way epigram developed as a literary genre. The so-called *Sylloge Simonidea* offers a tantalizing glimpse into early compilation practices: it has been argued that its origins can be dated back to the fifth century BCE.²⁶ In addition, Kathryn Gutzwiller proposed that an early form of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Peplos*, which included mini-epitaphs on epic heroes, prose genealogies, and other information, was a peripatetic assemblage from the later fourth century BCE.²⁷ The incorporation of inscribed epigrams in literary texts of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE—for example, in Herodotus' and Thucydides' *Histories*, which include eight and three inscribed epigrams respectively—enabled their wide dissemination and, most likely, played an important role in the creation of collections of inscribed epigrams in the fourth century BCE.²⁸ Philochorus' *Attic Epigrams* was probably such a collection, although nothing is known about it apart from its mention in the *Suda* lexicon (s.v. *Φιλόχορος*, φ 441 Adler). The title shows that geographical location was the primary factor in the selection of epigrams by the historian; but we do not know anything about their arrangement and their theme(s), or in fact whether the inscriptions were in prose, in verse, or in a blend of the two forms.²⁹ Moreover, as has plausibly been argued, fifth-century collections of metrical epitaphs circulating among engravers to provide them with models for inscriptions could have contributed to the compilation of collections of inscribed epigrams for the entertainment of a reading public.³⁰

Once detached from its bond to place or object—no longer written or carved on a tomb, monument, or object—epigram rapidly became and remained a major mainstream poetic form. It quickly flourished during the Hellenistic era and attracted some of the finest poetic talents the ancient world

interdisciplinary approach to Greek and Latin epigram, see Santin and Foschia (2016); for inscriptions and their reception in Greek and Latin literature, see Liddel and Low (2013).

²⁵ See e.g. Walsh (1990; 1991); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 219–33 (dedicatory and funerary epigram), 338–49 (erotic epigram); Meyer (1993; 2005; 2007); Bettenworth (2007), 69–93; Tueller (2008).

²⁶ See Sider (2007), 113–30. For the formation of the *Sylloge* and the epigrams attributed to Simonides, cf. Bravi (2006); A. Petrovic (2007b).

²⁷ Gutzwiller (2010a), 219–49.

²⁸ See Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 30–45. For inscribed epigram in pre-Hellenistic literary sources, see A. Petrovic (2007a, 49–68; 2007b, 52–89).

²⁹ Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 297 with n. 45, who remind us that, apart from historical inscriptions in prose, Philochorus was 'credited with a passion for collecting "oracles in verse" (FGrHist 328 T6)'.

³⁰ See Bing and Bruss (2007b), 6–7. Cf. Reitzenstein (1907); Tsagalis (2008), 53–6. On early epigram collections, see A. Cameron (1993), 1–18; Pordomingo (1994); Argentieri (1998); Gutzwiller (1998), 20–36; Parsons (2002), 115–22; A. Petrovic (2007b), 92–101.

produced. While some poets composed epigrams alongside other poetic genres, others specialized in epigram, as we can judge by the proxeny decree of the Aetolian League at Thermon (*IG IX 1² 1.17.24*, 263/2 BCE), where Posidippus is called an *epigrammatopoios*. What survives today represents only a minute proportion of the vast output of this artistic activity. The *Greek Anthology*, our chief source for epigrams, is itself a selective compilation from a series of selective ancient compilations.³¹ The steady stream of modern publications of epigrams preserved on papyri, but not in the *Greek Anthology*, or in other literary sources such as Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*, attests to the popularity of the genre in the ancient world and, more importantly, continues to deepen our understanding of its features and development in antiquity.³² To offer three chief examples of such recent discoveries in the field: the Milan Papyrus (*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309*) preserves 112 epigrams attributed to Posidippus, of which only two were previously known (*AP* 119 = *HE* 18 = 65 A–B and *HE* 20 = 15 A–B). The papyrus codex *P. CtYBR inv. 4000* contains around sixty fragmentary epigrams attributed to Palladas of Alexandria by Kevin Wilkinson,³³ while we knew of just two of them before its publication (ep. 37 W p. 21, ll. 4–8 = *Pall. AP* 9.379 and part of ep. 28 W p. 12, ll. 28–31 = *Pall. AP* 9.127). The recently published Vienna Epigrams Papyrus (*G 40611*), dating from the late third century BCE, includes 226 incipits of epigrams selected from at least four books of an unspecified, possibly multi-authored collection. Only the incipit in column i. 14 can be attributed to a poet already known from the *Anthology*, Asclepiades, since it survives as the opening line of *AP* 12.46 = *HE* 15.³⁴ Epigram also inspired Latin poets, notably Martial, Catullus, and Ausonius, and survived the rise of Christianity as the dominant state religion.³⁵ Like other genres, it virtually disappeared during the cultural and political upheavals that the Byzantine world experienced in the mid-seventh and eighth centuries CE, but experienced a revival in ninth-century Byzantium³⁶ and yet another one in the form of the neo-Latin

³¹ For the history of anthologies of Greek epigrams, see A. Cameron (1993).

³² For papyri including epigrams, see Gutzwiller (1998), 20–36 and p. 12 in this chapter.

³³ See Wilkinson (2012), who dates Palladas' poetry to the age of Constantine. Benelli (2015) suggested that this is a multi-authored anthology, possibly including poems of Palladas. For a discussion of Palladas' date and other interrelated issues, see e.g. Ast (2014); Dijkstra (2014); Kanellou (2014); Floridi (2014b; 2016); Benelli (2016); A. Cameron (2016). On Palladas and ecphrasis, see Bing's chapter in this volume.

³⁴ The incipit in col. ii. 10 partially overlaps with the beginning of the anon. *AP* 14.106. The edition of the papyrus is by Parsons, Maehler, and Maltomini (2015); for the papyrus before its publication, see e.g. A. Cameron (1993), 9–10; Argentieri (1998), 12–13.

³⁵ For Hellenistic epigram and Latin elegy, see Keith (2011); see also the chapters by Gutzwiller and Fantuzzi in this volume, and compare those of Beta and Kanellou. For the *epigrammata Bobiensia*, see Nocchi (2016); for the epigrams attributed to Lucian, see e.g. Setti (1992) and Baldwin (1975); for intratextuality in Martial's epigram, see e.g. Fitzgerald (2007).

³⁶ See Lauxtermann (2003), 131–48. For epigram, art, and personal piety in later Byzantium, see Drpić (2016).

epigrams of the Renaissance and after.³⁷ Epigram has had a profound influence in modern times with imitations in many languages, including Latin and ancient Greek,³⁸ stretching into the twentieth century, most notably influencing Ezra Pound and Constantinos Cavafis.³⁹ In sum, epigram has maintained its popularity almost without interruption from archaic Greece to the modern world.

During the last couple of decades, the increasing popularity of literary epigram in the Hellenistic period became the focal point of several studies. As Peter Bing and Jon Bruss argue, Hellenistic poets must have been attracted by its textuality and by the ample scope it offered for experimentation.⁴⁰ The separation of the text from its original material contexts allowed for innovative developments of its two traditional epigrammatic subgenres. Although some epitaphic literary epigrams originated as inscribed texts, sepulchral epigram could now become a purely fictional work referring to the (imagined) grave of a historical or fictive figure, and this allowed the epigrammatists to explore different ways of arousing pathos.⁴¹ This class of epigrams, like others, rapidly acquired subcategories, such as those for famous poets (mainly) of the past,⁴² for soldiers,⁴³ for men drowned at sea,⁴⁴ and for animals—both large and

³⁷ See De Beer, Enenkel, and Rijser (2009). For epigram from the Hellenistic period until the Renaissance, see Laurens (1989); for the reception of Greek epigram from the early nineteenth century to the years after the First World War, see Nisbet (2013); for a more comprehensive overview, see Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 140–62. On epigram and European literature, see Häusle (1979), 31–45.

³⁸ See in general Nisbet (2013), and esp. 83, 87, and 140; Money (2015).

³⁹ Ezra Pound's own words (see *Letters* 249, edited by Paige 1951, 312) express his admiration for the *Greek Anthology*: 'Obviously in the last analysis the grade of any period depends on one, two or a few of the best writers. The Greek anthology is not a contradiction; it does not represent the mediocrity of one decade but the florilegium of a long series of decades.'

⁴⁰ Bing and Bruss (2007b), 6–7, with n. 26; cf. Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 6 and 46–7.

⁴¹ See e.g. Antiphil. *AP* 7.176 = *GPh* 25, one of a number of poems that address the issue of the disturbed grave. Antiphilus plays on the idea of the naked corpse on the shore but transfers it to fertile farmland. The tomb is disturbed by the plough, leaving the corpse to lament that not even death brings release from suffering. Mel. *AP* 7.182 = *HE* 123, Antip. Thess. *AP* 7.185 = *GPh* 16, and Phil. *AP* 7.186 expand upon the traditional idea of the virgin for whom death replaces marriage. All three poems deploy the motif of the contrast between the funeral torch and the marriage torch, while two of them inject an element of paradox by having the bride die on her wedding night so that the antithetical torches become one and the same. The motif is turned on its head by Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 7.367 = *GPh* 63 when applied to the groom (on the topic, see Harder's chapter in this volume). Agathias *AP* 7.552 uses the long-established dialogue form to explore a complex of emotions of loss, the pathos of death and burial far from home, the mother's grief at separation from her child and the child's anticipated grief at the death of his mother.

⁴² For epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax, see Rosen (2007). For epigrams on poets, see e.g. Gabathuler (1937); L. Rossi (2001), 81–106; Kanellou (forthcoming) with further bibliography. For epigrams pseudonymously ascribed to famous poets of the archaic and classical periods, see Page (1981), 119–30; Sens (2007), 374–5.

⁴³ On military epitaphs, see Barbantani's chapter in this volume.

⁴⁴ See e.g. Di Nino (2010), 77–187; Mateo Decabo (2015); Tueller's chapter in this volume.

small, right down to insects.⁴⁵ Additionally, the fictive dimension of this type of sepulchral poem offered opportunities for the creation of ironic distance and humour. This allowed for still further variation in tone, including a commingling of the serious and humorous that can often render the overall poetic tone elusive and open the possibility of multiple readings of the same short piece.⁴⁶ Literary epigrams imitating verse inscriptions on a statue base or monument can also recreate the work itself, in ecphrasis, and in the process they can explore the aesthetics of the artefact and the nature of artistic representation. The series on Myron's cow (*AP* 9.713–42) is an excellent example of an epigrammatic game with inscriptional norms.⁴⁷ Literary dedicatory epigrams also inventively explore the set of relationships between the giver, an inscribed object, and the recipient through the dialogue created between the object and an imagined passer-by.⁴⁸

In parallel with the play on inscriptional conventions, epigram was rapidly taken outside its traditional boundaries. Asclepiades is the first known epigrammatist to employ this form as a vehicle for exploring the theme of *eros* and its predicaments. Hellenistic epigrams also parody inscriptional norms, engage in personal invective prompted by literary disputes and historical events, and involve satirical attacks against sympotic figures, gluttons, and drunkards.⁴⁹ The Vienna Epigrams Papyrus opens up the possibility that satirical *topoi* considered so far to be typical of Lucillius' and Nicarchus' skoptic epigrams, such as the mockery of professional categories and physical defects, had actually been already treated by the Hellenistic poets.⁵⁰

The expansion of epigram's thematic range reflects the epigrammatists' absorption of themes and functions from preexisting genres. The archaic and classical periods saw a vast outpouring of sympotic poetry; such poetry commented on or referred to its context by celebrating drinking and fellowship, providing advice on arrangements for the symposium, making appeals to drink, offering guidance on wine and mixtures, and including descriptions of drinking and its effects. As the symposium was a locus for desire and

⁴⁵ E.g. Antip. Sid. *AP* 7.209 = *HE* 57, Anyt. *AP* 7.190 = *HE* 20, Mnasalc. *AP* 7.192 = *HE* 12 and *AP* 7.194 = *HE* 13, and Nic. *AP* 7.200 = *HE* 4.

⁴⁶ See e.g. Antip. Sid. *AP* 7.218 = *HE* 23, an interesting melange of praise and blame, with Kanellou (2016), 200–1; for the serio-comic tone of erotic epigrams, see Kanellou (2013).

⁴⁷ See Squire (2010b). On the ecphrastic epigram, see the chapters by Bing, Floridi, and Smith in this volume.

⁴⁸ For general discussions over the innovations of dedicatory epigrams, see e.g. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 219–33; Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 54–67.

⁴⁹ On Hellenistic skoptic epigram, see e.g. Blomqvist (1998); Floridi (forthcoming). Studies and commentaries on skoptic epigram include Galli Calderini (1984) on Hedylus, Nisbet (2003) on imperial skoptic epigram, Schatzmann (2012) on Nicarchus, and Floridi (2014a) on Lucillius. See also Floridi's chapter in this volume.

⁵⁰ For this point, see Floridi (2016; forthcoming). Another innovation of the Hellenistic era is the so-called bucolic epigram, on which see L. Rossi (2001). For the six *technopaegnia* included in *AP* 15, see Kwapisz (2013a).

seduction, lyric poetry and elegy (mainly Mimnermus and Theognis) served as a medium for addressing the theme of love: declarations of love, descriptions of the impact of love and of the torment of unrequited love, songs in praise of the beloved, recriminations and appeals, prayers to Aphrodite. But lyric song was more or less extinct by the time we get to the early classical period; no major talents emerged after Anacreon's death in the early fifth century BCE. This partial vacuum was filled by epigram. The topics of wine and love were taken up by the epigrammatists and continuously reworked and reinvigorated, in an endless game of poetic imitation and competition. Hellenistic epigrams engaged with archaic personal lyric poetry not only at a thematic and rhetorical level but also through intertextual gestures toward specific poets and poems. A characteristic case study is the continuous adaptation of Sappho's *γλυκύπικρον ἀμάχανον ὄρπετον* ('bittersweet, irresistible crawling creature', fr. 130 V).⁵¹

This does not exhaust the richness of the poetic form. The strong satirical-parodic strand in epigram reflects the influence of iambus and comedy.⁵² The themes of archaic iambus included not just love but also graphic depictions of sexual exploits; iambus was also a medium for humour and parody and for the pursuit of quarrels, the enactment of revenge, and the expression of hate. Jokes, vulgar language, ridicule, and satire were also constant features of Attic comedy and, while the burlesque of the gods and their myths bloomed in fourth-century mythological comedy, illicit relationships, rapes, and unrequited loves were a key ingredient of New Comedy. Epigrams absorbed and refreshed material from both genres. For instance, courtesans of every sort, from the expensive high-society jewel to the readily available prostitute, were an indispensable presence at the symposium and accordingly featured in all small-scale archaic poetry. But the sheer ubiquity of the hetaera in epigram and the recurrent motifs of subservience to her and praise or blame probably owe much to fourth-century Athenian comedy. In addition, epigrams ridicule and satirize not only humans but gods as well; here one detects the influence of mythological comedy. Since no unbridgeable borders existed between the various epigrammatic subtypes originally categorized on a thematic basis, the skoptic element was intermingled with the erotic one already during the Hellenistic era. Take for instance Hellenistic erotic epigrams describing sex-scenes—an excellent representative of this type of erotic-skoptic epigram with emphasis on sexual intercourse is

⁵¹ For erotic epigram and its absorption and reuse of earlier poetry, see Kanellou (2012). On the Meleagrian sequence on Eros *AP* 5.176–80, see Gutzwiller's chapter in this volume.

⁵² For points of contact between epigram, iambus, and comedy, see e.g. Brecht (1930); Schatzmann (2012), 96–105. For the reception of iambus in antiquity, see Rotstein (2010); Carey (2016).

Dioscorides AP 5.54 = HE 7 and AP 5.55 = HE 5—a feature originating in archaic iambus.⁵³

Just how far Hellenistic epigram replicated the performance culture of previous centuries is still a matter of debate. The theory that Asclepiades and other epigrammatists improvised their epigrams at symposia has found both followers and critics.⁵⁴ As a partial model, it has much in its favour. The symposium remained an important feature of Greek culture and there is no reason to suppose that poetry lost its place at the symposium. It is reasonable to assume that epigrams suitable for the ambience of drinking parties could have been read out or even improvised at symposia⁵⁵ and then reworked for publication in authorial collections. From such authorial collections they could then find their way into an anthology. At the same time, however, in the bookish culture of the Hellenistic era, other epigrams would have been composed exclusively for a readership, imitating the symposiastic atmosphere.⁵⁶ Gutzwiller rightly recognized that the circulation by the early third century BCE of collections of short lyric songs and elegies—probably abbreviated versions or excerpts from longer poems—enabled the thematic expansion of epigram, since the generic boundaries between the two forms were now blurred, elegy losing its sympotic context and epigram its inscriptional framework.⁵⁷

Epigram was, beyond doubt, a highly experimental field for the Hellenistic poets. Its ability to absorb and amalgamate a wide range of archaic and classical poetic genres and motifs makes it a remarkable phenomenon in Greek literature.⁵⁸ All literary genres are both dynamic and flexible, in that there is a constant interplay between the implicit generic model shared by the artist and the audience or readership and the specific form it takes in any given case; each instance bends and stretches the generic model and contributes to the future expectations of the audience or readership. But the broad outline

⁵³ On mythological burlesque and epigram, as well as on erotic-skoptic epigram, see Kanellou's chapter in this volume.

⁵⁴ See Reitzenstein (1893), 87–104; A. Cameron (1995), 71–103. The theory was resisted by Gutzwiller (1998), 115–16; Bing (2009), 113–15; and see now F. Cairns (2016), 4–7.

⁵⁵ Later epigrammatists were well known for their extemporizations: two examples are Antipater of Sidon (Cic. *De or.* 3.194) and Archias (Cic. *Arch.* 18).

⁵⁶ See Gutzwiller (1998), 116–17.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*; cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 289; Bing and Bruss (2007b), 11–12 with n. 44; Sens (2011), xliii–xliv. One such collection of elegiac couplets survives: the so-called *Theognidean Sylloge*, which could have been in circulation by the fourth century BCE. The extent of its influence on Asclepiades' poetry, though, is difficult to assess, given the uncertainty about its form and content at the time when Asclepiades composed his poems (see Bowie 2007). On epigram and elegy, see Gentili (1968); on Asclepiades and the origins of erotic epigram, see Magini (2000); Sens (2011), xlii–xlvi. On sympotic poetry and epigram, see Giangrande (1968).

⁵⁸ The concept of *Kreuzung der Gattungen* was first introduced by Kroll (1924), 202–24 and subsequently reformed by other scholars; see e.g. L. E. Rossi (1971); Fantuzzi (1980); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 17–26.

rarely changes radically, as it does in the case of epigram.⁵⁹ Moreover, the establishment of the elegiac couplet as the canonical form for the epigram had an important effect. By comparison with many of the metres of archaic personal poetry, this was a very accessible verse form. This combination of simplicity and brevity made epigram arguably the most ‘democratic’ verse form that ancient Greece produced. It was challenging enough to appeal to the best poetic talents; its brevity was attractive, since storytelling on this scale is demanding. In the hands of a master, a single word, phrase, or change of register alters the tone dramatically, or hints at a specific model that redirects one’s response. Nonetheless, this brevity and the undemanding metre placed the medium easily within reach of much more modest exponents and partly accounts for the popularity and longevity of the genre: the *Greek Anthology* alone includes more than 350 named and an unknown number of unidentified poets.⁶⁰

As an inscribed form, epigram was also prone to intergeneric and intertextual gestures and this tendency increased when it was detached from its material context. As literary epigram developed its own standing within the poetic options available, it also developed its own classic poets and texts that offered subsequent writers intertexts for allusion and models both to aspire to and to contest with; shared motifs and strands of allusion tie some of our earliest authors to texts dating from the Byzantine period. The transfer of epigram from stone to papyrus took place in an age when the primary mode of dissemination was the book text, irrespective of any performance. This bookishness opened up fresh opportunities to enrich and complicate the reading of individual poems. Authors could publish their own collections of epigrams,⁶¹ which allowed for precise intratextual gestures (and even thematic cycles) within the corpus of a single author.⁶² Written texts are not essential for such self-allusive gestures, but they facilitate the process by allowing the receiver to revisit and compare the texts and by creating opportunities for juxtapositions that enhance the intertextual relationships. Still further opportunities opened through the appearance of anthologies, which brought together selections from the work of different masters of the form. This allowed for cross-corpus juxtapositions that underscored the dialogue between epigrams by different poets and even served to create such dialogues. So the collective corpus

⁵⁹ The only parallel for this evolutionary leap is Attic comedy, which had evolved to a steady state both in thematic range and in form by the late fifth century BCE, but then changed radically in both these areas by the end of the fourth century BCE.

⁶⁰ Cf. Sider (1997), 45; Cameron and Parsons (2012), 99: ‘The Greek Anthology is one of the great books of European literature, a garden containing the flowers and weeds of fifteen hundred years of Greek poetry from the most humdrum doggerel to the purest poetry.’

⁶¹ Gutzwiller (1998), 54–75 and 117 argues that Anyte could already have produced such an author-edited collection.

⁶² This is not, of course, exclusive to epigram.

became richer with time, and not simply through the accretion of additional chronological layers of material. All of this makes the surviving epigrammatic corpus, though only a fragment of a much larger original, one of the richest and most rewarding products of the classical world.

2. THE COLLECTIVE VOLUME

As this collective volume goes to press, scholarship on Greek literary epigram is thriving. Seminal, beyond doubt, have been the commentaries of Gow and Page (1965 and 1968 respectively) on Meleager's and Philip's *Garlands* together with Page's (1981) *Further Greek Epigrams*. New impetus was given by Gutzwiller's (1998) *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, which turned the scholars' attention to epigram collections and contributed to research on individual epigrammatists.⁶³ Important work in the field has appeared in several studies during the last decades. We now have a growing number of commentaries on individual authors.⁶⁴ In addition, collective

⁶³ For epigram collections, see Argentieri (2007) on Meleager's and Philip's anthologies; also Höschle (2010). Bing's (1995; 1998) articles on Hellenistic epigram have provided the basis for further research on the complexity and artistic value of epigram. See also Fantuzzi (2004).

⁶⁴ Old and recent editions and translations of, and monographs on, individual epigrammatists include the following: on Agathias and his *Cycle*: Viansino (1967), Schulte (2006), Valerio (2014), and Giommoni (2017); on Ammianus: Schulte (2004); on Antipater of Sidon and Antipater of Thessalonica: Weigand (1840), Setti (1890), Waltz (1906), Clack (2001: Dioscorides and Antipater of Sidon), and Argentieri (2003); on Antiphrilos: Müller (1935); on Anyte: Baale (1903) and Geoghegan (1979); on Archias: Reinach (1890); on Argentarius: Small (1951); on Asclepiades: Peters (1923), Knauer (1935), Wallace and Wallace (1941), Clack (1999: Argentarius together with Leonidas of Tarentum), Guichard (2004), Ihm (2004), Nastos (2006), Sens (2011), and Di Marco (2013); on Callimachus: Bentley (1761), Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1897), Pfeiffer (1949–53), Cuenca y Prado (1974–6), Cuenca y Prado and Sánchez (1980), Coco (1988), Zannetto and Ferrari (1992), Pagonare-Antoniou (1997), Nisetich (2001), and Meyer (2005); on Christodorus: Tissoni (2000); on Crinagoras: Rubensohn (1888) and Ypsilanti (2018); on Dioscorides: Galán Vioque (2001); on Gregory of Nazianzus: Vertoudakis (2011); on Julian of Egypt: Schulte (1990); on Leonidas of Tarentum: Geffcken (1896), B. Hansen (1914), Bevan (1931), Labellarte (1969), and Solitario (2015); on Leontius Scholasticus: Schulte (2005); on Lucilius: Rozema (1971) and Floridi (2014a); on Macedonius Consul: Madden (1995); on Meleager: Manso (1789), Graefe (1811), Headlam (1890), Ouvre (1894), Radinger (1895), Clack (1992), and Guidorizzi (1992); on Mnasilces and Theodoridas: Seelbach (1964); on Nicarchus: Schulte (1999) and Schatzmann (2012); on Palladas: Zerwes (1956), Franke (1899), T. Harrison (1992), and Wilkinson (2012: on *P. CRYBR inv. 4000*); on Paul the Silentiary: Veniero (1916) and Viansino (1963); on Philodemus: Kaibel (1885), Gigante (1970), and Sider (1997); on Posidippus: Schott (1905), Fernández-Galiano (1987), A. Martín (1996), Bastianini and Gallazzi (1993), and see n. 66 in this chapter for bibliography focused on the Milan Papyrus; on Rufinus: Page (1978) and Höschle (2006); on Simias of Rhodes: Fränkel (1915); on Strato: González Rincón (1996), Steinbichler (1998), Floridi (2007), and Giannuzzi (2007); on Theocritus: Smutny (1955) and L. Rossi (2001). There are also editions of individual epigrammatists under preparation or in press, for example Ferrari's on Posidippus, Gutzwiller's on Meleager, and Guichard and Vezzosi's on Palladas. Recent translations of selected epigrams include Hine

volumes such as *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker 2002) and *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Bing and Bruss 2007a) have enhanced our understanding of epigram, especially during the Hellenistic era,⁶⁵ while several volumes explored the epigrams attributed to Posidippus (*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309*) from a variety of angles.⁶⁶ The recent publication of the Vienna Epigrams Papyrus (*G 40611*) (Parsons, Maehler, and Maltomini 2015) advanced research on the development of epigrammatic subgenres during the Hellenistic period⁶⁷ and on the selection and arrangement of epigrams in third-century BCE anthologies.⁶⁸ Academic discussion was also fuelled by the publication of *P. CtYBR inv. 4000* (Wilkinson 2012), attributed by its editor to Palladas (as noted earlier in this chapter). This papyrus codex, which contains mainly epideictic and skoptic epigrams with an intense political and topical colour,⁶⁹ is an important discovery, as it helps us to evaluate better the history of epigram, its transmission in Upper Egypt, and the criteria for producing ancient poetry books in later antiquity.⁷⁰ A forthcoming multicontributor volume centred on this papyrus codex aims to contribute to the discussion over the date and authorship of the epigrams, the interpretation of individual poems, and the organizational principles of the anthology.⁷¹

Against this background and with the rapid increase in the number of books devoted to Greek literary epigram, our present volume aims to contribute to the understanding and appreciation of the genre by shifting focus away from

(2001) and Fain (2010). For lists of editions of epigrams, see also e.g. Gow and Page (1965), 2: 681–4 and (1968), 2: 470–1; Sider (1997), 235–8; Ihm (2004), 133–4.

⁶⁵ See also Durbec and Trajber (2017) and Meyer and Urlacher-Becht (2017). A Blackwell companion to Greek epigram, edited by Henriksen, is in press, and a work titled *Dictionnaire de l'épigramme littéraire dans l'antiquité grecque et romaine*, to be edited by Doris Meyer and Urlacher-Becht, is under preparation. A steady publication of monographs continues to enrich our knowledge of the genre. Relevant bibliography can be found in the footnotes to this chapter. Further studies not mentioned so far include Prioux (2007), which discusses the ways in which Hellenistic epigram formulates and diffuses aesthetic theories of the era, and F. Cairns (2016), which studies Hellenistic epigrams in various contexts.

⁶⁶ Editions of the Milan Papyrus are Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001) and Austin and Bastianini (2002). Commentaries and collective volumes dedicated to it are Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou, and Baumbach (2004); Gutzwiller (2005b); Di Marco, Palumbo Stracca, and Lelli (2005); Lapini (2007); Di Nino (2010); and Seidensticker, Stähli, and Wessels (2015b).

⁶⁷ See e.g. Floridi and Maltomini (2016); Floridi (forthcoming).

⁶⁸ The papyrus was the subject of a round table organized in Pisa and titled 'Transmissions and Contexts of Epigrammatic Literature in the light of *P. Vindob. G 40611*'; see the review of the *editio princeps* by Barbantani (2015).

⁶⁹ Epigram 35 W p. 18, ll.1–9 could be erotic or erotic-skoptic (see Polemis 2013; Kanellou 2014; Floridi 2015a).

⁷⁰ At this point, the date of the papyrus is still under discussion; for instance, Duttonhöffer (in Wilkinson 2012, 15–16) proposes the time frame 280–340 CE, but Ast (2014) argues that, on palaeographical grounds, the papyrus should be dated to the second part of the fourth century CE. Cf. n. 33 in this chapter.

⁷¹ Kanellou and Carey (forthcoming).

an author-, collection-, and time-based study of epigram towards its exploration and analysis from wider perspectives and by adopting instead a diachronic approach, which treats the corpus as an organic whole. The volume originates in a three-day international conference, held at University College London in 2013, which aimed to investigate various facets of the evolution of Greek literary epigram, from the third century BCE up until the sixth century CE. The collected papers do not seek to offer a comprehensive treatment of the genre (as if this were possible). Rather our objective is to provide a selection of in-depth treatments of key aspects of Greek literary epigram, usually through the analysis of themes and topics in various subgenres over the course of time or through the reading of epigrams as parts of crafted sequences, authorial or editorial, and in the light of intrageneric evolution. Aspects studied include the dynamics of the relationship between literary epigram and its sociopolitical, cultural, and literary background over a long time span—from the third century BCE up until the sixth century CE—and its interaction with its inscribed origins, other literary genres, the visual arts, and (in certain cases) Latin poetry. The volume is divided into six interconnected thematic parts. Each part is composed of chapters that complement each other while simultaneously tackling core topics from a variety of angles.

The first part, 'Encountering Epigram', examines how the physical contexts in which we encounter epigrams—stones and ostraca, schoolbooks, private compilations, anthologies, manuscripts—and their arrangement impact our interpretation of them. Joseph Day argues that literary epigrams that represent the process of reading an inscription can be used as a medium to understand how pre-Hellenistic inscribed epigrams were read. His chapter concentrates on features of Greek literary epigrams that 'project' readings and viewings, meaning *deixis* (first-person and dialogic) and the description of objects that guide a viewer's responses (in ecphrastic dialogue epigrams and others that include lists of offerings). Andrej Petrovic explores the transmission of Greek epigrams outside poetic books, that is, in compilations of texts designed to satisfy an individual's needs and not for widespread distribution, such as ostraca and templates for stonemasons. He detects in such Hellenistic 'paraliterary' contexts resonances of contemporary literary production, and argues that already in the third century BCE school anthologies trained young readers in the sequential reading of epigrams and served as a means for disseminating Ptolemaic ideology. Regina Höschle's chapter challenges the view held in the past that Philip of Thessalonica was a second-rate editor by comparison to Meleager. She probes subtler modes of arrangement, which she detects in what remains from Philip's *Garland* in the *Palatine Anthology*: juxtaposition of model and variation; interweaving of epigrams anchored in thematic, structural, verbal, or intertextual connections; epigrammatic pairs or series on the same topic; clusters on key themes within individual letter groups. Kristoffel Demoen's chapter focuses on marginal texts in manuscripts

that have (mainly) authors and their work as their subject ('book epigrams'). He examines their paratextual status, which should be taken into account in the treatment of these epigrams in modern editions of the *Greek Anthology*, but he also stresses their 'fluidity': literary transmission turns them from paratexts into texts, while variations of the same book epigram can fulfil unexpected functions.

Part 2, 'Imitation, Variation, Interaction', examines modes of interaction between Greek literary epigram and other poetic genres, as well as the intrageneric play between epigrammatists who belong to different eras. Annette Harder's chapter offers a diachronic study of the Hellenistic epigram focused on the issues of thematic and generic variety as well as on the reception and 'miniaturization' of existing poetic genres—particularly of small-scale poetry, such as elegy, but also of didactic poetry—in Hellenistic epigram. Although these developments are more obvious in later epigrammatists, their seeds can be found in Callimachus and other poets of his generation. In Charles Campbell's contribution, imitation and variation are related to thematic engagement. Campbell examines the intricate ways in which Philodemus, Crinagoras, and Antipater of Thessalonica engage with the poetry of Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum. The three epigrammatists of Philip's *Garland* use their Hellenistic predecessors as positive or negative models of poetic values and ethical outlooks, upon which they define their own authorial self-representation. Simone Beta discusses the riddling epigrams of Book 14 of the *Greek Anthology* and common methods employed by the poets to disguise the solution of the *aenigmata* (homonymy, myths, and different kinds of wordplay). He traces the origins of specific techniques and riddles back to comedy, and contextualizes the epigrams within the Greek and Latin 'riddling tradition'. The comparative study of the relevant sources leads him to conclude that Byzantine poets could have been inspired by anthologies of riddles composed at different periods.

Part 3, 'Writing Death', examines the long-standing tradition of sepulchral epigrams. Richard Hunter explores the interrelationship between literary and inscriptional epigram, especially with regard to the quality of literariness. His analysis hinges on the study of an epigram (GV 1159 = SGO 03/05/04) about a young boy who drowned in a well and on its comparison with Posidippus (or Callimachus) *AP* 7.170 on grounds of versification, narrative technique, and language; this perspective brings to the fore the rich literary tradition adapted by the poet of the inscribed epigram. Silvia Barbantani studies Hellenistic and Roman inscribed and literary military epitaphs and addresses a number of interconnected issues: the unpopularity of epitaphs for individual soldiers in the *Greek Anthology*, the near absence of such inscribed epitaphs in literary sources despite the fact that they are often of good literary quality, and the question of their authorship. Doris Meyer examines emotions in literary epigrams that employ the motifs of grief and weeping, starting with selected

funerary epigrams by Callimachus and Posidippus and concluding with subversive and renewed uses in Lucillius and Gregory of Nazianzus. She studies emotions in epigram against the background of the literary tradition, while basing her investigation on ancient philosophical and rhetorical theories and on modern studies of the emotions, including the sociocultural approach of 'emotional history'. Michael Tueller examines literary sepulchral epigrams where the themes of boundaries and death are intermingled in intriguing and complex ways. He illustrates how these poems bridge, strengthen, or obscure these topics, which originate in inscribed epigram in the form of separation of the dead from the living or separation of the body from the soul. Even epigrams that seem at first glance unrelated can be seen as clever variations of this scheme, in a never-ending game of poetic debt and competition.

The two chapters of Part 4, 'Gods, Religion, and Cult', explore aspects of the evocation and representation of gods in literary epigram. Marco Fantuzzi analyses the epigrams connected with Cybele's cult and her priests and priestesses and their relation to Catullus 63—which comes before a string of negative or indignant portrayals of Cybele's *galli* ('emasculated priests') in imperial Rome and after critical remarks found in various sources on the lack of control caused by her music. He argues that Catullus reversed the motif of the lion's encounter with the *gallus* in the cave, used in several epigrams to offer a defensive or eulogistic presentation of Cybele's cult, so as to express an opposing standpoint. Kathryn Gutzwiller exemplifies how Greek epigrams, despite their small size, develop larger topics, especially when interacting with one another in an epigrammatic series; she argues that Hellenistic epigrams influenced not only imperial epigram but Greek and Latin literature more generally. She examines Meleager's *AP* 5.176–80, which represents a discourse on the nature of love. Meleager draws on Greek poetry, philosophy, and art and personalizes and focalizes earlier philosophical ideas about Eros through the lover's figure. His reshaping of philosophical ideas about Eros served in turn as a model for representing the lover's emotions in the later Greek and Latin tradition, including Vergil, Propertius, and Ovid.

The fifth part, 'Praise and Blame', explores literary epigrams where humans and gods are extolled or mocked. Maria Kanellou's chapter acts as a connecting link between the last two parts, since, by taking as her case study Zeus' love affair with Danae, she investigates the diachronic usage, in epigrams, of mythological burlesque for mockery turned against human and divine targets. In addition, the analysis of selected poems reveals the skoptic side of epigrams categorized as erotic; no hermeneutically sealed boundaries existed between the two subgenres. Federica Giommoni explores the use of literary epigrams as a vehicle for promoting a victorious image of emperors and for spreading political ideologies by means of traditional symbols of Greek supremacy and victory over the Persians. She argues that Hellenistic epigrams recall the victories of Alexander the Great against the Persians in order to cast the

same light on the Ptolemies, while in Agathias' *Cycle* legendary episodes from the Battle of Marathon and depictions of its heroes construct a triumphant image of Justinian against the Sassanians and contribute to this emperor's representation as the ultimate heir of the celebrated Greek past. Joseph Romero examines epigram as a tool for praising or blaming a philosopher or a particular school of philosophy, together with the techniques employed for these effects. He further argues that several epigrams disavow philosophy in general and champion instead epigram and poetry as a discursive medium.

The concluding part, 'Words and Images', charts the interrelation of literary epigram with ecphrasis. Lucia Floridi examines the interaction of skoptic epigram with the ecphrastic subgenre and the visual arts: skoptic epigram satirizes unskilled artists or the subject of their artwork, reversing ecphrastic topoi; motifs and devices closely tied with specific artworks are adapted, altering the role they play in ecphrastic models; skoptic epigram alludes to well-known works of art in order to elicit the reader's visual response and enhance the effect of the joke. Peter Bing examines how Palladas turned ecphrasis into a medium for reflecting on the tension between the Greek literary and cultural heritage and the sociopolitical and religious environment of his own turbulent times. In the hands of Palladas, ecphrastic modes are adapted to describe the dire realities of an age when statues of Greek gods were defaced, demolished, recast, or reconfigured by Christians. In the same vein, Steven Smith's chapter demonstrates the importance of contextualizing epigrams into the sociohistorical circumstances of their era in order to achieve deeper comprehension of the transformations that motifs undergo through space and time. He analyses a cluster of epigrams on imperial gardens that date from the first to the seventh century CE and shows how these poems reflect diverse views about imperial power, aesthetics, pagan culture, and Christianity.

Although, as noted above, they make no claim to offer a comprehensive overview of the genre, the chapters in this volume demonstrate, individually and collectively, its remarkable richness and diversity. In the process, they help to explain the fascination that epigram exercised both in the ancient world and in subsequent ages and contribute to the growing body of research on this significant and versatile poetic form.

Part 1

Encountering Epigram

Reading Inscriptions in Literary Epigram

Joseph Day

‘We (the reader’s readers) read the inscription looking over his shoulder, or peering through a window at the back of his skull.’¹ George Walsh thus describes our experience as readers of a literary epigram in which the author ‘presents himself . . . as someone who reads an inscription’. To be sure, Greek literary epigrams often reflect self-consciously on the process of reading,² thereby providing ‘an ecphrasis of a text’ as well as of an image, a description of reading as well as of viewing, although they often stretch or complicate the description with wit, irony, and other literary effects.³ I shall discuss here reading of the sort that interested Walsh, namely that figured as the reading of an inscription, and I suggest that such literary representations have something to say about the reading of actual inscribed epigrams. For this reason, but also because, as a newcomer to literary epigram, I have had to economize, I limit myself mainly to *Greek Anthology* Books 6 and 7, both teeming with ‘quasi-inscriptional’⁴ epigrams.

Illustrative examples will set our stage, although Doris Meyer and others have examined these, including Heraclitus *AP* 7.465. Two persons approach a fresh grave, and one suggests to the other (‘wayfarer’) that they ‘decipher the writing and see whose bare bones the stone says it protects’:⁵

γράμμα διακρίναντες, ὁδοιπόρε, πέτρον ἴδωμεν,
λευρὰ περιστέλλειν ὅστέα φατὶ τίνος.
(Heraclit. *AP* 7.465.3–4 = *HE* 1.3–4)

¹ Walsh (1991), 103.

² Indeed, they thematize reading. See Meyer (2005, 4–10, 117–26, *passim*; 2007); Schmitz (2010a).

³ Squire (2009), 160–5; quotation at 164. I owe this reference to Ivana Petrovic.

⁴ Bing (2009), 204.

⁵ See Gow and Page (1965), 2: 305; also Meyer (2005), 119–21; Meyer (2007), 205–6; and differently F. Cairns (2016), 27–8.

The following two distichs constitute an epitaph equally at home on stone or papyrus:⁶ *ξεῖν', Ἀρετῆμιός εἰμι* ('O stranger, I am Aretemias', v. 5). The poem is less an imitation of an inscription than a representation of one read aloud⁷ by persons who lend their voice to the deceased Aretemias. Some poems emphasize the physicality of reading, as does Posidippus 104.3 A–B: *εἰ δὲ βάδην ὑπάγεις, μ[άθ]ε καί...* ('if you are to go step by step, learn too...'). Learning more about the deceased requires the addressee to take one step further, as if to read an inscription in smaller letters or engraved elsewhere on the monument.⁸ Callimachus *AP* 7.522 represents reading an epitaph in fits and starts:

*Τιμονόη'. — τίς δ' ἐσσί; μὰ δαίμονας οὐ σ' ἂν ἐπέγνων
εἰ μὴ Τιμοθέου πατρὸς ἐπὶ ὄνομα
στήλη καὶ Μήθυμνα, τεῖ πόλις. ἦ μέγα φημὶ
χῆρον ἀνιάσθαι σὸν πόσιν Εὐθυμένῃ.*

(Call. *AP* 7.522 = *HE* 40)

'Timonoe'. But which one are you? By gods, I would not have recognized you if your father's name, Timotheus, were not added on the stele, as well as Methymna, your city. Truly I declare, your widower husband Euthymenes grieves terribly.

A passer-by reads the name 'Timonoe', interrogates the text, answers with three other inscribed proper nouns, and responds sympathetically.⁹ The process was no doubt imagined as vocal, a dialogue between a reader and him-/herself. The beginning of Menophila's inscribed dialogue, on the contrary, offers two distinct voices (stele with the deceased's image, Sardis, c.150–100 BCE):¹⁰

*κομψὴν καὶ χαρίεσσα πέτρος δείκνυσσι. τίς ἐντί;
— Μουσῶν μανύει γράμματα· 'Μηνοφίλαν'.*
(SGO I 408–9, 04/02/11 = *GV* 1881, vv. 1–2)

After commenting, 'Even the charming stone shows the woman is refined', one voice asks, 'Who is she?'. The other answers by quoting the prose heading:¹¹ 'The Muses' letters indicate, "Menophila"'. The dialogue then turns to the meaning

⁶ Cf. Cairon (2009), no. 85 (= *GV* 1606); Posidipp. 56 A–B, Antip. Sid. *AP* 7.464 = *HE* 53, also Diosc. *AP* 7.166–7 = *HE* 39–40.

⁷ Cf. Gutzwiller (1998), 7.

⁸ Cf. Nisetich (2005), 40, but Tueller (2008), 70.

⁹ See Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 318–20; Meyer (2005), 202–5; Meyer (2007), 203–4; Schmitz (2010a), 382–4; Tueller (2008), 79–80; Walsh (1991), 94–7; and differently F. Cairns (2016), 24–6.

¹⁰ See Squire (2009), 161–5, fig. 2.14, pl. 4; Connelly (2007), 251–2, fig. 8.23, pl. 27; but cf. Kauppinen (2015), 134–6, no. 13. On interactions between literary and later inscribed epigram, see the chapters of Barbantani, Hunter, and Smith in this volume.

¹¹ *Ὁ δῆμος Μηνοφίλαν Ἑρμαγένου* ('the people [sc. set up] Menophila daughter of Hermagenes').

of symbols engraved on the stone, as in dialogic poems that represent interaction with a monument as solving a riddle.¹² Viewing rather than reading is normally represented, but a kind of reading appears in Alcaeus of Messene *AP* 7.429 = *HE* 16, where the speaker begins by puzzling over the double Φ inscribed on a grave and attempts two solutions to the riddle.¹³

Such literary representations of reading surely tell us something about reading actual inscriptions, but what? Peter Bing has argued that reading inscribed epigrams became common, if ever, only in the Hellenistic period, thanks in part to the popularity of literary epigram.¹⁴ I have argued that archaic and classical epigrams were read, at least often enough for people to keep putting them up.¹⁵ To a degree, we have talked past each other. Bing emphasizes the lack of pre-Hellenistic literary accounts of reading inscriptions.¹⁶ I emphasize the physical context of earlier inscriptions: layouts that attracted and guided reading, wording that framed viewers' likely responses, and groups of epigrams encouraging cross-referencing.¹⁷ One way to nudge the conversation forward is to suggest that the representations of reading in literary epigrams say something historical about pre-Hellenistic epigraphic reading.

Literary epigrammatists certainly reflect both epigraphic reading of their own day and the reading of inscriptions in paper collections.¹⁸ Nevertheless, I put great stock in certain features common to epigrams of all periods, namely those that enable texts to 'project' future readings and viewings. Composers imagined reading as a speech situation in front of the inscribed object, and they wrote features of that situation into the text so as to fit or guide future readings in specific ways. In effect, they 'projected' desirable readings and, as we shall see, viewings, not entirely unlike a financial planner who 'projects' a certain future behaviour of an investment. My goal here is to illustrate how, in many literary (and some later inscribed) epigrams, features typical of such projections appear in—or in contexts containing—representations of reading. These features fit, guide, or problematize the circumstances of reading, or rather the mental creation of reading an inscription while viewing a

¹² See Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 328–38; Goldhill (1994), 199–206; Gutzwiller (1998), 265–76; Prioux (2007), 244–90; Walsh (1991), 92–3; see also n. 42 in this chapter. For the riddling epigrams in *AP* 14, see the chapter by Beta in this volume.

¹³ See Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 92–3; Meyer (2005), 123–4.

¹⁴ Bing (2002) = Bing (2009), 116–46.

¹⁵ Day (2010), 26–84; cf. Livingstone (2011), 32–6.

¹⁶ For more optimistic assessments of earlier poets' and audiences' epigraphic literacy, see Liddel and Low (2013), chapters by Day (217–30), Fearn (231–53), Lougovaya (255–70), and LeVen (271–87).

¹⁷ On the last subject, we are closer; see Bing (2014); Day (2018).

¹⁸ For Hellenistic epigraphic reading (not primarily of epigrams), see Ma (2007a; 2013). For paper collections, see Schmitz (2010a), 385–90; cf. Bing (1995), 116 = Bing (2009), 86–7; A. Petrovic (2013).

monument. Earlier inscriptional epigram lacks explicit representations of reading,¹⁹ but projections of it abound. I see no reason to deny that these projections were meant to, and regularly did, fit or guide readings of earlier inscribed epigram, in something like the manner in which formally comparable projections are imagined as working in literary epigram.²⁰

I discuss two types of projection: *deixis* construed to fit a speech situation generated by vocal reading; and description of the inscribed object intended to fit or guide viewers' responses, thus a projection of reading that complements viewing.

Epigrams project reading as speech—which it was, since most reading was vocal. From the fourth century BCE (CEG 532), and especially from the Hellenistic period, inscribed and literary texts make it explicit that inscriptions produce speech, as in Antiphilus of Byzantium AP 6.97.1–2 = *GPh* 21.1–2: λέγει δέ σε γράμματ' ἐκεῖνον | . . . θέσθαι ('the letters say that man . . . dedicated you [the object]'). Callimachus has more fun at AP 6.147.3–4 = *HE* 24.3–4: ἦν δ' ἀρα λάθῃ . . . | φησὶ παρέξεσθαι μαρτυρίην ὁ πῖναξ ('if you [the god] forget . . . the tablet says it will provide evidence').²¹ A few earlier inscribed epigrams are similarly explicit.²² Very many more, however, are marked deictically to fit or guide a speech situation in which readers played various roles, speaking in their own or another's voice.²³ Literary epigrams exploit this type of *deixis*,²⁴ sometimes within dramatizations of reading inscriptions. I illustrate this point with, first, an epigraphical use of the first person and, second, dialogue epigram.

The first person applied to the inscribed object is epigraphically common and old. CEG 326 demonstrates this (bronze statuette, Thebes?, c.700–675 BCE):²⁵

Μάντικλός μ' ἀνέθεκε φεκαβόλοι ἀργυροτόξοι
τᾶς {δ}δε[κάτας· τὸ δέ, Φοῖβε, δίδου χαρίζετταν ἀμοιβ[άν].
(CEG 326)

Mantichlus dedicated me to the far-shooter, silver-bowed (god)
out of his tithe. May you, Phoebus, grant him a delightful return.

¹⁹ Quotations of inscribed text in (quasi-)dialogic contexts represent reading implicitly—see e.g. CEG 286.2. Cf. CEG 108.7, 120, 429.3–4 with n. 22 in this chapter; also 'Simon.' *AP* 123 = *FGE* 31. For quotations in literary epigram, see n. 21 here.

²⁰ Cf. Squire (2009), 161.

²¹ See Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 316; Meyer (2005), 216–17; Meyer (2007), 199–200. The inscription's speech is quoted e.g. at Call. *AP* 7.447 = *HE* 35, Philet. *AP* 7.481 = *HE* 2, Theoc. *AP* 7.262 = *HE* 23. Cf. *GV* 1312 (Bernand 1969, 173–5, no. 34), Posidipp. 39.2?, 51.1–2?, 105, 106? A–B. See Tueller (2008), 141–54; Walsh (1991), 79–88.

²² CEG 108.6, 173, 286, and 439. At CEG 429.1 (= *SGO* I 47, 01/12/05), the voice itself is interrogated (αὐδὴ τεχνήεσσα λίθο(υ), λέγε, 'artful voice of stone, say'); see Svenbro (1993), 56–62; Tueller (2008), 150–1.

²³ For Meyer (2005), 4–10, 35–6, 51–88, *passim*, such staging of reading was always the central generic feature of epigram. See chapters by Schmitz (25–41), Tueller (42–60), Vestreheim (61–78), and Wachter (250–60) in Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (2010); see also Day (2010), 45–6, 112–20; Tsagalis (2008), 217–24, 258; Tueller (2008), 12–56.

²⁴ See e.g. Bing (1995), 121–3, 131 = Bing (2009), 93–5, 105.

²⁵ See Day (2010), 33–48.

Readers literally lend their voices to the image, but their role-playing results from a kind of deictic shorthand, namely the composer's way of imagining reading as speech in the immediate presence of the object, without attribution of life and mind to it.²⁶ Literary epigram, however, moves in that direction as in Callimachus *AP* 6.310 = *HE* 26: the dedicator of a tragic mask 'gave me' (διδούς ἐμέ), but now 'I hang dedicated here, yawning wide' (ἐγὼ δ' ἀνὰ τῇδε κεχηνώς | κείμαι) through pupils' tiresome recitations.²⁷ Such poems derive charm from an inscriptional *deixis* that is intended to fit a speech situation but does so hyperrealistically, as readers channel a vivid personality in imaginary objects.

Callimachus edges closer to a representation of reading at *AP* 6.149:

φησὶν ὃ με στήσας Εὐαίνετος—οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
 γινώσκω—νίκης ἀντί με τῆς ἰδίης
 ἀγκεῖσθαι χάλκειον ἀλέκτορα Τυνδαρίδῃσι.
 πιστεύω Φαίδρου παιδὶ Φιλοξενίδεω.
 (Call. *AP* 6.149 = *HE* 25)

The one who placed me, Euaenetus, says—for I don't know
 myself—that, in return for my victory,
 I, a bronze rooster, am dedicated to the Tyndaridae.
 I do believe the son of Philoxenus' son Phaedrus.

The rooster's utterance, in other words the whole poem, contains what inscriptions must: the dedicator's name and family, the reason for the offering, a mention of the object, and the name of the divine recipient. However, Callimachus problematizes such information gained from reading.²⁸ The bronze may speak—that is, we may read its inscription—but it underlines its inanimate status rather than ignoring that status, as is normal.²⁹ Reading only mouths words the dedicator supposedly says, but in Euaenetus' absence no real witness can verify the matter: 'I don't know.'

Dialogue epigram evolved from joining the epigraphical first person to another old deictic habit: the second-person address to a god, passer-by, or someone else.³⁰ One voice can utter both, as in the Mantichus epigram (*CEG* 326), but in a dialogue normally two voices speak. Typically a passer-by asks questions, and the monument or the represented figure answers

²⁶ See Bakker (2016), 197–202; Christian (2015), 28–45; Day (2010), 45–6, 112–13; Meyer (2005), 18–19, 68–76; Svenbro (1993), 26–43; Tueller (2008), 12–13, 16–27.

²⁷ See Bruss (2010b), 133; Meyer (2005), 193–5; Tueller (2008), 190–1. Cf. Call. *AP* 6.311 = *HE* 27, also *AP* 6.148 = *HE* 16.

²⁸ Meyer (2005, 196–8; 2007, 200–1). Cf. Christian (2015), 67–72; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 316–17; Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 55; Tueller (2008), 141–54, 191–2.

²⁹ Cf. 'Sapph.' *AP* 6.269.1–2 = *FGE* 1.1–2.

³⁰ See Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 306–28; Meyer (2005), 83–8, 206–17; Schmitz (2010a), 377–81; Tsagalis (2008), 257–61; Tueller (2008), 42–3; and now Kauppinen (2015). See nn. 19 and 22 here.

in epigraphic language. Implicitly, the answers represent an inscription being read, but some poems are more explicit. Callimachus *AP* 6.351 produces hilarious results by offering the dedication's voice and, unusually, the god's:³¹

τὶν μὲ, λεοντάγχ' ὄνα σνοκτόνε, φήγινον ὄζον
 θῆκε — τίς; — Ἀρχίνος. — ποῖος; — ὁ Κρής. — δέχομαι.
 (Call. *AP* 6.351 = *HE* 22)

To you, lion-strangling boar-slaying lord, I, an oaken branch,
 was dedicated — By whom? — Archinus — Which one? — The Cretan — I accept.

Epigraphic forms, especially the first-person pronoun and the third-person aorist of the verb of dedication,³² indicate that the reading of an inscription is dramatized. The fun starts when Heracles breaks in, as if impatiently interrupting a plodding reader with questions that would be answered, if he allowed the reading to continue.³³ The end brings more humour. A δέξαι-prayer, 'accept (the gift)', is common in dedications. Reading aloud, in the god's space, an inscribed δέξαι helped to frame encounters with a dedication as religiously successful reperformances of dedicatory ritual,³⁴ an idea that literary epigrammatists reflect, as in Posidippus 38 A–B. If the text is correctly restored, δέξαι appears in a quotation from a rite commemorated by the dedication, verbally repeated as the epigram is read:³⁵ Ἀρσινόη μ' [ἀνέθ]ηκεν Ἐπικρατίς ὧδ' ἐ[πεὶ . . .] . . . εἰπέ τε. ' . . . καὶ δέξα[ι . . .] ν δῶρον Ἐπικρατίδ[ος]' ('Epicratis dedicated me to Arsinoe here, when she . . . and said, " . . . and accept the gift of Epicratis"'). Callimachus *AP* 6.351 seems to be moving towards such a prayer,³⁶ but Heracles anticipates the reader's δέξαι with δέχομαι, in his haste to grab a new club.³⁷ In effect, this piece represents a successful ritual interaction between reader and god, comparable, minus the humour and the god's voice, to the one projected in the Manticlus epigram (*CEG* 326), with its epigraphical first person and the second-person prayer.

³¹ See Meyer (2005), 214–17 and Meyer (2007), 204; Tueller (2008), 106–70; Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 55–6; Schmitz (2010a), 380–1; and, differently, F. Cairns (2016), 285–9.

³² For τὶν μὲ, cf. *CEG* 190, also 336.

³³ The inscription could have continued with θῆκε Ἀρχίνος ὁ Κρής ('dedicated by Archinus the Cretan'), which scans.

³⁴ Day (2010), 67, 70, 116, 201, and 248–50.

³⁵ Cf. anon. *AP* 6.42, Antip. Sid. *AP* 6.47 = *HE* 43, Diod. *AP* 6.243 = *GPh* 3, Jul. Aegypt. *AP* 6.18 (assuming that vv. 5–6 are Lais' words). See also anon. *AP* 6.23 = *FGE* 17, Crin. *AP* 6.242 = *GPh* 9 and *AP* 6.253 = *GPh* 43, Jul. Aegypt. *AP* 6.12 and *AP* 6.19, Leon. *AP* 6.300 = *HE* 36 (cf. *AP* 6.190–1), Maced. *AP* 6.40, Nicaen. *AP* 6.225 = *HE* 1, Noss. *AP* 6.265 = *HE* 3, and Phil. *AP* 6.251 = *GPh* 7; and compare Myrin. *AP* 6.108 = *GPh* 1 (δέξάμενοι), Posidipp. 3 A–B.

³⁶ As in his more conventionally epigraphic *AP* 6.347 = *HE* 21: Ἀρτεμι, τὶν τόδ' ἄγαλμα . . . σὺ μὲν δέξαι ('Artemis, for you this *agalma* . . . May you accept').

³⁷ At Leon. Alex. *AP* 6.324 = *FGE* 3, Ares refuses the gift with the formula οὐ δέχομαι ('I don't accept'); cf. Antip. Sid. *AP* 9.323 = *HE* 60, Leon. *AP* 9.322 = *HE* 25, and Mel. *AP* 6.163 = *HE* 120.

The second feature of projected reading in epigrams to be considered here is the description of the inscribed object, whereby epigrams project a reading that complements viewing. The texts explain, identify, or describe the object and give reasons for its display; or they are designed to fit or categorize viewers' anticipated responses to it or to prompt those responses. This is all ecphrasis, broadly defined—as Jon Bruss does³⁸—to encompass more than the full descriptions of objects or viewing experiences in later inscribed and literary epigrams such as the poems about Myron's heifer: 'I think it is going to moo.'³⁹ In earlier epigram, description is compact and formulaic, but it is designed to jibe with viewers' responses. The term *agalma*, for example, identifies a dedication by the 'sought-for response' of its divine recipient and mortal viewers, and viewing could confirm that the object was an *agalma*.⁴⁰ Epitaphs elicit pity verbally, but IG I³ 1219 (= CEG 51) coordinates that response with one generated by viewing (stele base, Cерамеикус, c.510 BCE):

οἰκτίρο προσορῶ[ν] | παιδὸς τόδε σῆμα | θανόντος :
 Σμικυθ[ο], | ὁὗς τε φίλον ὄλεσεν | ἔλπε' ἀγαθὴν.
 (IG I³ 1219 = CEG 51)

I pity as I gaze on this sema [tomb] of a boy who died,
 Smicythus, who destroyed the good hope of his loved ones.

Did passers-by who encountered those earlier monuments cooperate in producing the projected reading to accompany their viewing? Description in later epigram, though formally related to that of earlier inscriptions, typically facilitates the representation of an imagined viewing.⁴¹ However, many of these texts also highlight reading, so that viewing and reading are represented as proceeding in complementary fashion. I doubt that this association of description with reading and viewing was a Hellenistic invention; later epigrammatists surely drew on a long history of reading descriptive inscriptions that projected reading as a complement to viewing. I illustrate this point with epigrams containing dialogues and lists, which effectively combine an ecphrasis of viewing with one of reading. Dialogues do so by juxtaposing two types of wayfarers' questions, those answered by reading inscriptions and those answered by viewing objects. Lists create a comparable double ecphrasis by neatly separating a group of objects a viewer is imagined as seeing from

³⁸ Bruss (2010a).

³⁹ Antip. Sid. AP 9.724.1 = HE 40.1 (cf. Antip. Thess. AP 9.728 = GPh 84); cf. AP 9.713–42, 9.793–8, Posidipp. 66 A–B, with Goldhill (1994), 204–5; Gutzwiller (1998), 245–50; Männlein-Robert (2007a), 263–9; Männlein-Robert (2007b), 83–103; Squire (2010b).

⁴⁰ See Bruss (2010a), 388 (quotation); Day (2010), 85–129.

⁴¹ Anticipated in Smicythus' epitaph; see Bruss (2010a), 396; Goldhill (1994); Gutzwiller (2002), 86. See the chapters by Bing and Floridi in this volume.

explanatory information that could only derive from the reading of an accompanying inscription.

Menophila's inscribed epitaph starts, as we saw earlier in this chapter, with a dialogic representation of reading; there follows a dialogic representation of viewing that begins with an imagined viewer's question about puzzling features of the relief:

τέυ δ' ἔνεκεν στάλα γλυπτὸν κρίνον ἥδ' καὶ ἄλφα,
βύβλος καὶ τάλαιρος, τοῖς δ' ἔπι καὶ στέφανος;
(SGO I 408–9, 04/02/11 = GV 1881, vv. 3–4)

For what reason is a lily carved on the stele, and an alpha,
a book and a basket, and above them a garland?

In the next two couplets, the monument's voice answers by explaining the symbols, as it answered the opening question by quoting the inscription.⁴² 'Dialogue as ecphrastic method' is common in literary epigram, and reading is sometimes part of the dialogue, as in Posidippus *AP* 275 concerning a statue of Kairos.⁴³ The epigram consists in the questions of an imagined passer-by and Kairos' answers, beginning with these:

τίς πόθεν ὁ πλάστης; — Σικυώνιος. — οὐνομα δὴ τίς;
— Λύσιππος. — σὺ δὲ τίς; — Καῖρος ὁ πανδαμάτωρ.
(Posidipp. *AP* 275.1–2 = *HE* 19.1–2 = 142.1–2 A–B)

Who, from where is the sculptor? — Sicyonian. — What's his *name*?
— Lysippus. — And who are you? — Kairos, the all-dominating.

The statue answers the first two questions, it seems, by quoting an inscribed signature.⁴⁴ Is the third one answered from an inscribed name label?⁴⁵ The questions and answers in the next four distichs, however, all concern the puzzling iconography of the statue. In Meleager *AP* 7.428, the imagined viewer carries on a dialogue with himself about the visual puzzles (vv. 1–18),⁴⁶ but

⁴² The lily symbolizes her prime, the alpha (= 1) her only-begotten status, the book her wisdom, the basket her virtue, and the garland her office. For symbols, SGO I 409 cites *AP* 7.421–9, esp. Antip. Sid. *AP* 7.423 = *HE* 28 and Alc. Mess. *AP* 7.429 = *HE* 16, and SGO II 172–3, 09/05/17 (= GV 1324). See n. 12 in this chapter and pp. 26–7 on Posidipp. *AP* 275 = *HE* 19 = 142 A–B and Mel. *AP* 7.428 = *HE* 122; also Bruss (2010a), 401–3 on *CEG* 596.

⁴³ See Männlein-Robert (2007a), 260–2, quotation at 260; also Gutzwiller (2002), 95–6; Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 64–6.

⁴⁴ For Λύσιππος Σικυώνιος ἐπο(ί)ησε ('Lysippus the Sicyonian made'), see *CEG* 791, 794, also 786.

⁴⁵ Name labels were often extrametrical, as on Menophila's stele. Asclep. *AP* 68 = *HE* 39 incorporates a label into an imagined viewer's speech; cf. Sens (2002), 256; Sens (2011), 264–6, citing *CEG* 803.

⁴⁶ See Goldhill (1994), 202–6; Gutzwiller (1998), 273–6.

guessing the deceased's identity ends in the last distich with another epigraphic quotation:

καὶ δὴ σύμβολα ταῦτα· τὸ δ' οὖνομα πέτρος αἰεῖδει,
 'Ἀντίπατρον', προγόνων φύντ' ἀπ' ἐρισθενέων.
 (Mel. AP 7.428.19–20 = HE 122.19–20)

These are the symbols, then. But the stone sings the name,
 'Antipater', born of mighty ancestors.

Description of puzzling iconography and symbols through a dialogic ecphrasis of viewing can, then, be complemented by a dialogic representation of reading. Viewing and reading are assumed to proceed side by side, a practice that the ubiquity of description in earlier epigram suggests had happened when Greeks encountered inscribed monuments; reading was projected, and actually served, as a complement to viewing. Description in literary dedicatory epigrams, however, need not involve puzzling imagery; especially when a quotidian or perishable object was offered, an epigram could explain what it was or how it was used as well as why it was given. Common among such explanatory poems in Book 6 of the *Greek Anthology* are lists of multiple objects dedicated as a group, often tools of a trade offered to mark success in it or retirement from it.⁴⁷ List poems, just as ecphrastic dialogues, enable their readers to imagine the viewing of a dedication and the reading of its accompanying inscription.

Some list poems begin with the list and end with the dedicatory formula reminiscent of inscriptions; I turn to those later on. In other cases, the list interrupts the inscriptional material as in Leonidas of Tarentum AP 6.204 = HE 7, where the list splits the dedicatory formula. That formula starts in verse 1: Θῆρις ὁ δαιδαλόχειρ τῇ Παλλάδι ('Theris the skilled [carpenter] to Pallas'); it concludes in verse 4, after a list of five tools: ἐκ τέχνας ἄνθετο παυσάμενος ('[them he] dedicated, having retired from his craft'). A list splits Antipater's inscribed epigram from Delos differently.⁴⁸ A dedication is complete in the first couplet: πέντε τὰδ' . . . Φι[λό]στρατε θήκ[αο δῶρα] ('these five gifts you dedicated, Philostratus'); the sixth couplet contains a prayer for the dedicator: εἴης πᾶς μακάριστος ('may you be all-blissful'). Between dedication and prayer, the offerings are listed with comments on their form, material, and use.⁴⁹

Werner Peek suggested a similarity between list poems and inscribed temple inventories of dedications, and the Delian inventories show how

⁴⁷ See Gow and Page (1968), 2: 63 on Antip. Thess.? AP 6.109 = GPh 54; Bruss (2010b), 122 (citing L. Rossi 2001, 131–4 on Theoc. AP 6.177 = HE 6), 132–4 (citing Gutzwiller 1998, 88–114).

⁴⁸ I. Délos 2549 = Antip. Sid. HE 42 (text of Peek 1957, 104–5), c.100 BCE.

⁴⁹ A dedicatory verb probably reappeared at the end of v. 9. See Gow and Page (1965), 2: 67; Peek (1957), 106. See also Fantuzzi (2008), 615–22.

right he was.⁵⁰ Inventory items often appear in groups, and information copied from lost dedicatory inscriptions⁵¹ shows that such groups were sometimes dedicated together, as units.⁵² Poetic lists and inventory entries also betray specific similarities. Items in epigrams turn up in inventories: for example, although the distaffs and spindles in *I. Délos* 1442B.56 (= Hamilton 2000, Artemision D.132) are small and silver, we can compare several poetic lists of spinning equipment.⁵³ Inventories and list poems regularly make quantitative comments: they specify the number of objects,⁵⁴ their size,⁵⁵ and their material.⁵⁶ Finally, inventories comment on the condition of dedications,⁵⁷ which can become part of the fun in epigrams: while in Leonidas of Alexandria *AP* 6.324 = *FGE* 3 Ares rejects shiny new arms and armour, other poems carefully point to damage or grime acquired in battle.⁵⁸

One might explain list poems without recourse to temple inventories. Sanctuary visitors would have seen groups of objects, and poet visitors might rise to the challenges of composing backstories for such groupings or, more likely, inventing their own imaginary collections. Certainly, once a theme such as carpenters', or fishermen's, or weavers' tools was started, poets kept the literary game alive by inventing clever new ways to name, describe, and group obscure instruments. Nevertheless, the idea of grouping coupled with specific parallels suggests at least an original debt of list poems to inventories, another example of epigraphic literacy as a source of epigrammatic play beyond the obvious influence of inscribed epigram.⁵⁹ If this is true, the poets' adaptation of inscriptional

⁵⁰ Peek (1957), 110–12; cf. Gutzwiller (1998), 229.

⁵¹ Cf. Prêtre (2012), 20–3.

⁵² E.g. *I. Délos* 1442A.52–3 (= Hamilton 2000, Serapeion D.185): *χιτων[ίσκ]ον καὶ χλαμύδ[α] καὶ ζωάριον καὶ πορπίον ἔχον ἀσπιδίσκην ἀργυρᾶν, ἀνάθημα Ἱερ[οκ]λείας Ἀρφοκράτει* ('short tunic and mantle and small belt and small brooch bearing a silver boss, the dedication of Hierocleia for Harpocrates').

⁵³ Antip. Sid. *AP* 6.160, 6.174 = *HE* 4–5, Arch. *AP* 6.39 = *GPh* 8, Leon. *AP* 6.288–9 = *HE* 41–2, and Phil. *AP* 6.247 = *GPh* 22.

⁵⁴ For an inventory, see e.g. *I. Délos* 1403BbI.83–4 = Hamilton (2000), Poros D.29, '2 shields with inscriptions, 4 without'. For a poem, see e.g. Leon. *AP* 6.129 = *HE* 34, which lists eight shields, helmets, etc.

⁵⁵ Inventory, e.g. *I. Délos* 1403BbI.61–2 = Hamilton (2000), Poros D.1, 'phiale in plinth about 5 palms' (*παλαστῶν*). Poem, e.g. Leon. *AP* 6.286.1–2 = *HE* 40.1–2: *τῆς πέζης τὰ μὲν ἄκρα τὰ δεξιὰ μέχρι παλαιστής | καὶ σπιθαμῆς οὐλῆς Βίττιον εἰργάσατο* ('Bittion worked the right-hand end of the border, up to a palm and a whole span').

⁵⁶ Inventory, e.g. *I. Délos* 1442A.52–3 (see n. 52 here), 1442B.56 (see at n. 53 here). Poem (inscribed), e.g. Antip. Sid. *HE* 42.6–7 (see n. 48 here): *ἄμφω ταῦτα παναργύρεα . . . χρυσέα ῥυτὰ* ('both of these all silver . . . gold rhytons').

⁵⁷ For a damaged gorgoneion, see *I. Délos* 1439AbcI.48–53 (cf. *I. Délos* 1441AI.67–70, 1450A.48–50) = Hamilton (2000), Apollo D.119. See also Prêtre (2012), 32–8.

⁵⁸ See n. 37 in this chapter and Paul. Sil. *AP* 6.84, Hegesipp. *AP* 6.124 = *HE* 1, Mnasalc. *AP* 6.125, 6.128, 6.264 = *HE* 4–6, and 'Simon.' *AP* 6.52 = *FGE* 61.

⁵⁹ For literary authors reading inventories, see Kosmetatou (2013) on Herodotus and Kosmetatou (2015) on various authors, including epigrammatists. Compare the debt of literary *iamatika* to the (mostly in) prose *iamata* (which themselves reflect earlier dedicatory inscriptions). Especially on Posidipp. 95–101 A–B, see Bing (2004) = Bing (2009), 217–33; Wickkiser (2013).

models was doubly clever: they poetized inventory-like content; and they switched the epigraphic genre by turning what prose inventories inspired into imaginary dedicatory epigrams.⁶⁰ Through this double adaptation, poets represented imaginary encounters with dedicated groups bearing inscriptions; or, more accurately, they enabled readers of a poem to enact imaginatively the viewing of a group and the reading of its inscription. We can compare the effects of the ecphrastic dialogue epigrams discussed previously in this chapter.

The lists in these epigrams, that is, their poeticized inventories, enable readers to envisage the objects or to imagine or enact a viewing of them, just as the descriptive or ecphrastic parts of dialogue epigrams do. Two regular features of poetic lists, much less typical of inventories or absent from them, confirm that such visualization was one of the poets' goals. The first is the colourful descriptive vocabulary, illustrated by Leonidas of Tarentum AP 6.205:

τέκτονος ἄρμενα ταῦτα Λεοντίχου· αἶ τε χαρακταὶ
 ῥῖναι καὶ κάλων οἱ ταχινοὶ βορέες,
 στάθμαι καὶ μιλτεῖα καὶ αἶ σχεδὸν ἀμφιπλήγες
 σφῦραι καὶ μίλτω φυρόμενοι κανόνες
 αἶ τ' ἀρίδες ξυστήρ τε καὶ ἐστελεωμένος οὗτος 5
 ἐμβριθής, τέχνας ὁ πρύτανις, πέλεκυς,
 τρύπανά τ' εὐδίνητα καὶ ὠκήεντα τέρετρα
 καὶ γόμφων οὗτοι τοὶ πίσυρες τορέες
 ἀμφίξουν τε σκέπαρνον· ἃ δὴ χαριεργῶ Ἀθάνᾳ
 ὠνήρ ἐκ τέχνας θήκατο πανόμενος. 10
 (Leon. AP 6.205 = HE 8)

These (are the) implements of the carpenter Leontichus: the toothed files and the rapid devourers⁶¹ of logs, plumb lines and red-ochre lines and by their side the double-headed hammers and rulers stained with *miltos* [red ochre], and the drill bows and smoother and this helved, heavy axe, the *prytanis* [president] of his craft, easily turning augers and quick gimlets and these four *tores*⁶² of dowels and an adze with round helve. These to graceful-working Athena the man dedicated (when) he retired from his craft.

⁶⁰ Most dedicatory inscriptions reflected in Delian inventories were in prose, but *I. Délos* 380.71–2 (cf. *I. Délos* 421.67, 439a.39, 442B.41, 461Ba.47–8) = Hamilton (2000), Apollo C.97, quotes an epigram (composite text): κυμβίον (ἐφ') οὐ ἐπιγραφῇ· Ἰστιαεὺς μ' ἀνέθηκε Κάλλωνος ὑπερ, φίλ' Ἀπολλων, | τήνδε· συναμφοτέροις εὐτυχίην ὅπασον ('A small cup (on) which an inscription: Histiaeeus dedicated me, this (cup), on behalf of Callon, dear Apollo; may you grant good fortune to both together'). (For readers more at home with epigraphic conventions, | here indicates just the end of the hexameter.) The text of a cure from Epidaurus also quotes an epigram: see *IG IV*².1 121.3–9, with Bing (2004), 280–1 n. 23 = Bing (2009), 222 n. 24.

⁶¹ Apparently saws or planes; see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 317.

⁶² For these tools, see *ibid.*, 2: 318, on v. 8.

Among the retired carpenter's tools, the files are 'toothed', his hammers 'double-headed', his rulers 'stained with red ochre', the axe 'helved, heavy', the adze 'with round helve'. Such straightforward description is used for precious objects in inventories,⁶³ but epigrams apply it to humble tools and greatly increase its density (of Leonidas' thirteen items, only four are simple nouns). Poets also add comments on the function of items (Leonidas' 'devourers of logs', augers that are 'easily turning', gimlets that are 'quick') and colourful asides (the axe is the 'president of his craft').⁶⁴ The second way lists in epigrams enable visualization is through deictic markers. Proximal deictics in inventories are cataphoric (or anaphoric), that is, they refer to items later (or earlier) in the text. The first deictic in AP 6.205 is cataphoric (v. 1): *these* (are the) implements of the carpenter Leontichus'—and the list follows.⁶⁵ More often, however, poetic *deixis* is exophoric, that is, it points to objects outside the text but close and visible, as in AP 6.205 we have, 'this axe . . . these four *torees*', and, differently, 'the hammers *by their* [sc. the preceding items'] *side*'. When we read AP 6.205, our mind's eye follows the text as it points now to this item, now to that, and as it lingers over the names and descriptions of the implements.

As epigrammatic dialogue epigrams can have a separate part that mimics reading rather than viewing, something outside the lists proper enables readers of list poems to imagine or enact readings of inscriptions. I refer to the echoes of inscribed epigram, especially its essence, namely the dedicatory sentence (dedicator, verb, recipient, motive) and, frequently, a prayer. My point is clearest in the many poems (and there are thirty-seven of them in *Greek Anthology* Book 6) where these elements gather at the end, after the list, as in the following epigram composed by Leonidas of Tarentum:⁶⁶

†εὐκαπὲς† ἄγκιστρον καὶ δούνακα δουλιχόεντα
 χώρμην καὶ τὰς ἰχθυόκους σπυρίδας
 καὶ τοῦτον νηκτοῖσιν ἐπ' ἰχθύσι τεχνασθέντα
 κύρτον, ἀλιπλάγκτων εὖρεμα δικτυβόλων,

⁶³ Description in Delian inventories is simple and repetitive. Apart from quantitative and condition remarks (see p. 28 in this chapter), two kinds predominate: basic description of complex objects and identification of images, both illustrated by the damaged gorgoneion (see n. 57 here) and IG XI.2 287B.70 (cf. *I. Délos* 298A.29, etc., with Prêtre 2012, 112–14) = Hamilton (2000), Apollo B.86 ('ring gold w. cornelian w. Nike image'; cf. C.3, D.137).

⁶⁴ Verbal play was as much of a goal as visualization. Leon. AP 6.205 offers several otherwise unattested uses or words; see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 317–19. For variations on the theme of this poem, see Leon. AP 6.204 = HE 7 and Phil. AP 6.103 = GPh 18, with F. Cairns (2016), 452–3.

⁶⁵ In Delian inventories, e.g. τὰδε starts lists, as at *I. Délos* 1421Ab.15–16: 'these, i.e. the following, are in the *prodomos* of the temple'.

⁶⁶ Cf. AP 6.4–5, 21–2, 27–8, 38 (except σοί, 'to you', in v. 1), 41, 62–7, 81, 90, 92, 94 (except σοί in v. 1), 95, 101–4, 109, 160, 165, 170 (except τῷ Πανί, 'to Pan', in v. 1), 201, 211, 232–3, 247, 294, 295 (except the dedicator's name in v. 1), 296, 298, 306; cf. AP 6.58, 78, 85–6, 117, 129, 131, 176. I count 102 epigrams in Book 6 of the *Greek Anthology* that could be considered list poems and do not gather dedicatory information at the end, but many keep it separate from the lists.

τρηχύν τε τριόδοντα, Ποσειδαώνιον ἔγχος,
καὶ τοὺς ἐξ ἀκάτων διχθαδίους ἐρέτας
ὁ γριπεὺς Διόφαντος ἀνάκτορι θήκατο τέχνας
ὥς θέμις, ἀρχαίας λεύβανα τεχνοσύνας.

(Leon. AP 6.4 = HE 52)

A hook easily gulped down⁶⁷ and a long pole
and a line and the fish-holding creels
and this weel cunningly contrived for swimming fishes,
an invention of sea-roaming net casters,
and a rough trident, the lance of Poseidon,
and the pair of oars from his boats
—(all these) the fisherman Diophantus dedicated to the lord of his craft
as is right, the remnants of his old craftsmanship.

Readers of this type of epigram mimic the way people encountered inscribed dedications in sanctuaries. The object or the whole monument was the eye-catching thing; it attracted passers-by before they could read an inscription. They would approach more closely, pick out visual details, and begin assigning meaning. Leonidas starts *in medias res*: we are already close enough to take in the group of modest objects, including a fish hook. From that point on, the poem forces us to complete the process of viewing. Our mental gaze stops at each item: we note its appearance ('long pole . . . rough trident') or we imagine its function ('easily gulped down . . . fish-holding . . . contrived for swimming fishes') or history ('invention of sea-roaming net casters'). Thanks to the descriptive language of the list, we readers not only envisage the assemblage of objects but also enact a viewing of them.

Viewing, though, leaves unanswered the kinds of questions imagined in dialogic evocations of reading: Who dedicated, to whom, why?⁶⁸ In encountering a real dedication, people would have to move close enough to satisfy their curiosity by reading the inscription, after viewing was under way. In reading Leonidas of Tarentum AP 6.4, that curiosity is satisfied in the final distich, after the descriptive list: 'fisherman Diophantus, to the lord of his craft, upon retirement'. After a longer list of implements, Antipater of Thessalonica AP 6.109 = GPh 54 concludes with a dedicatory formula that reveals the offerer's full identity (patronymic, name, craft, ethnic, demotic) with truly epigraphic concision:

σοί, Πάν ὦ σκοπιῆτα, γέρας θέτο παῖς Νεολάδα
Κραῦγυς ὁ θηρευτὰς Ἀρκὰς ἀπ' Ὀρχομενοῦ.
(Antip. Thess. AP 6.109.9–10 = GPh 54.9–10)

⁶⁷ Paton (1916–18), 1: 301; see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 360.

⁶⁸ On provoking and satisfying readers' curiosity in epigram, see Walsh (1991), 92–103.

To you, Pan haunter of heights, as a gift [the preceding fowling tools]
 were dedicated by the son of Neolaidas,
 Craugis, the hunter, Arcadian from Orchomenus.

Readers of such epigrams imagine or enact two processes: viewing groups of objects first, then reading dedicatory inscriptions. Non-list epigrams can work similarly, as we saw at Meleager *AP* 7.428: viewing is reproduced in the (internal) iconographic dialogue (vv. 1–18); at the end (vv. 19–20), reading is enacted through the name ‘Antipater’, which is presented as inscribed on the monument.⁶⁹ And visitors to cemeteries, sanctuaries, and agoras did experience this dual process of first viewing, then reading.

Herodas’ fourth mimiamb narrates the kind of scene that literary epigrams brought to life in their readers’ minds. In a very literary vignette, but one that was unlikely to contradict significantly its original audience’s expectations about sanctuary behaviour, a pair of women approach and admire dedicated statues before a temple of Asclepius. One character, her curiosity piqued, questions her companion:⁷⁰

—ᾄ, καλῶν, φίλη Κυννοῖ,
 ἀγαλμάτων· τίς ἦρα τὴν λίθον ταύτην
 τέκτων ἐπό<λει καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ στήσας;
 (Herod. 4.20–2)

Ah, my dear Cunno, what beautiful
 statues [*agalmata*]! What artist made this stone,
 and who is the dedicator?

Cunno answers with the names, which she reads or paraphrases from an inscription:

—οἱ Πρηξιτέλειω παῖδες· οὐκ ὀρῆς κεῖνα
 ἐν τῇ βάσει τὰ γράμματα; Εὐθύης δ’ αὐτὰ
 ἔστησεν ὁ Πρήξωνος.
 (Herod. 4.23–5)

The sons of Praxiteles. Don’t you see
 the letters there on the base? And Euthies
 the son of Prexon dedicated them.

Earlier literature may lack such narratives, but we can put some faith in reconstructions of archaic and classical Greeks doing physically something like what readers of lists and ecphrastic dialogues in literary epigrams do mentally: viewing first, then reading. Let us imagine visitors to the Athenian

⁶⁹ Cf. e.g. anon. *AP* 6.45 = *HE* 43, Antip. Sid. *AP* 6.46 = *HE* 2, Crin. *AP* 6.229 = *GPh* 4, Stat. Flacc. *AP* 6.196 = *GPh* 2; also Posidipp. 63 A–B.

⁷⁰ Text of Di Gregorio (1997), 28, 267–9. See Day (2010), 69–73.

Acropolis shortly before Xerxes' invasion. As they passed through the archaic Propylon, the canyon between the Old Athena Temple on the north of the processional way and the rising pre-Parthenon to its south focused their gaze on an impressive monument at the far end of the street: Callimachus' dedication.⁷¹ A slightly smaller than life-size Nike stood atop a three-metre column planted at the highest point on the Acropolis rock, near the northeast corner of the pre-Parthenon, facing the processional way. The monument would draw our visitors closer and closer, finally into a position in front of it, from which they could look directly up into Nike's face and enjoy the fullest view of her running figure. Viewers standing there also occupied the best spot for reading the inscriptions: with a slight tilt of their heads to the right, they looked directly at the pair of clearly and attractively inscribed epigrams that cascade down the column, one in each of the two flutes beneath Nike's central axis (CEG 256 = IG I³ 784):

- i. [Καλίμαχος μ' ἀν]έθεκεν Ἀ(φ)ιδναῖο[ς] τᾷ θεναίαι :
 ἄν[γελον ἀθ]ανάτων τοῖ Ὀ[λύμπια δόματ'] ἔχουσιν. *Vacat*
 [Callimachus] of Aphidna dedicated [me] to Athena, (me)
 the messenger of the immortals who have their homes on Olympus.
- ii. [Καλίμαχος? πολέ]μαρχος Ἀθηναίων τὸν ἀγὼνα :
 τὸν Μα[ραθῶνι πρὸς ἡ]λένων ὁ[(~) ~ ~ ~ ~ c.11 :]
 πασιὺν Ἀθηναίων μν[εμ?] ~ ~ ~ ~ ~].
 [Callimachus? the pole]march of the Athenians . . . the contest
 at Ma[rathon on behalf of?] the Hellenes . . .
 a memorial? for the sons of the Athenians . . .
- (CEG 256 = IG I³ 784)

The linearity of the inscriptions (the alignment with Nike's vertical axis, the long smoothed band with the two flutes surrounded by rough stippling) drew readers' gaze forward from top to bottom. Other features (the clear separation of the two poems, the punctuation marking the ends of hexameters) guided accurate reading.

But did our visitors actually read the epigrams? At the London conference, Peter Bing emphasized that any reconstruction of reading is speculative; and he was right. However, the physical features of location, monument, and inscription that ground a reconstruction are not speculation. They and comparable features in many archaic and classical monuments seem designed to attract and guide reading as well as viewing, and I believe that they sometimes succeeded. More to the point here, literary epigram enhances the plausibility of our reconstructing readings of earlier epigrams on the basis of the texts themselves. Verbal features that project future reading in Hellenistic and later

⁷¹ Keesling (2010).

epigram, for example deictic grammar and description of the inscribed object construed to fit such readings, are formally related to old epigraphic features such as the restored 'me' and the description of Nike in the first Callimachus epigram. As we have seen, these projections in literary epigram can work as they were intended, namely to fit or guide representations, or prompt enactments, of reading imaginary inscriptions while viewing the imaginary inscribed objects. The poets had no direct access to the character of people's encounters with monuments hundreds of years before their day. However, the epigraphic forms they reflect are old, and I see no reason to conclude that the functions the poets associate with those forms involve some sort of 'nostalgic back-projection by later Greeks',⁷² and thus to deny that those functions had an earlier history. To that extent, literary epigram supports the conclusion that projected readings in earlier inscribed epigrams actually did fit or guide readings by passers-by.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I offer my sincere thanks to Christopher Carey, Maria Kanellou, and Ivana Petrovic for organizing the excellent London conference and inviting me to participate, and to my fellow speakers for their stimulating contributions. I hope Peter Bing takes my effort to oppose his article of 2002 as a token of the deep respect with which I approach all his work on Greek epigram. Unless otherwise indicated, texts of literary epigrams are quoted from Gow and Page (1965), Gow and Page (1968), and Austin and Bastianini (2002) for Posidippus, and texts of inscribed epigrams are quoted from *CEG* or *SGO*.

⁷² I owe this wording, and other helpful suggestions, to one of the anonymous reviewers of Oxford University Press.

Lessons in Reading and Ideology

On Greek Epigrams in Private Compilations of the Hellenistic Age

Andrej Petrovic

1. INTRODUCTION

While epigrammatic collections attested in literary papyri of the Hellenistic period, along with later poetry books containing epigrams, have attracted significant scholarly attention and deservedly continue to provide inspiration for excellent investigations,¹ the epigrammatic material contained in the papyri of private collections remains somewhat side-lined. Therefore the principal aim of this chapter is to explore the epigrams attested on papyri outside poetic books in the strictest sense and to investigate the compilations privately assembled for individuals' personal use. This aim affects my use of the term 'private compilation'. All our literary papyri are, of course, private in some respect, as they are products of a scriptorium, and then are purchased and privately owned, or they are products of personal copying. When I say private *compilation*, however, I refer to Hellenistic (and later) collections consisting of excerpts of generically heterogeneous poetry put together to serve an individual's purposes or needs, such as those assembled for use at Hellenistic symposia, as a mnemonic support,² or for educational purposes in schools.³ The line I draw is between collections

¹ The landmark study is Gutzwiller (1998); on poetic books, see the contributions in Bing and Bruss (2007a); Bing (2009); Höschle (2010); Parsons (2002); Prioux (2008); the survey on Posidippus in Seidensticker, Stähli, and Wessels (2015a), 9–17.

² Performance of epigrams at symposia is well attested: see Ath. 3.125 c–d, *FGE* 'Simon.' 88 with Reitzenstein (1893), 89–96; Giangrande (1968); A. Cameron (1995), 71–131; Nisbet (2003), 31–3; Gutzwiller (2005b), 287–9.

³ On this, see Criboire (1996); Wissmann (2002; 2010).

intended for widespread distribution ('poetic books') and collections intended for personal or restricted use: the distinction is partly one of production, partly of purpose, and partly of audience or readership.

For this reason, and because in most cases this material reflects the employment of epigrams in school contexts, I also give an overview of the epigrams attested on ostraca of the Hellenistic period. In doing so, I attempt to detect resonances of literary production such as we hear in the sympotic and school contexts, and I consider the possible impact of Hellenistic literary tastes and Ptolemaic ideologies on contemporary (and later) school education.

My main theses are as follows. Building on discussions by Raffaella Cribiore and Jessica Wissmann,⁴ I posit that the epigrams found in private compilations simultaneously mirror and canonize a distinctly Hellenistic and, perhaps more precisely, a distinctly Ptolemaic notion of what an epigram is, what it can do, and how it should be read. From what we can tell, the paraliterary tradition,⁵ as embodied in the remains of private compilations, confirms that by the start of the third century BCE the readers of Greek epigram on papyri, like the readers of fourth-century BCE verse inscriptions (to an extent),⁶ had already developed a penchant for reading epigrams in sequences. Furthermore, I suggest that this might very well be the consequence of a new and increasingly fashionable type of epigrammatic literary production, which systematically encouraged cross-referential instead of insulated readings of epigrams, but also (and perhaps somewhat more surprisingly) of a particular, *epigrammatic education* of readers. Finally, apart from encouraging the reception of epigrams as parts of series and thus fostering their sequential readings, epigrams from compilations that formed part of Hellenistic schools' curricula also served as a medium for the dissemination of Ptolemaic ideologies.⁷

⁴ See n. 3 in this chapter.

⁵ With the term 'paraliterary' I refer to sources that do not represent ancient literary books in the strict sense of the word. Correspondingly, by paraliterary epigrams I do not mean epigrams subsidiary or subordinate to those transmitted in poetic books, but epigrams stemming from sources or compilations other than poetic books (although epigrams could stem from other types of books, such as anthologies of school texts and exercises). On the application of the term 'paraliterary', see Huys and Nodar (2007), 453–4.

⁶ On the reception of epigrammatic anthologies on stone, and especially on the Daochus monument, see Bing (2014) and Day (2018). For a general survey of anthological intimations ('elemental anthologies') in inscriptional evidence, see Fantuzzi (2010), esp. 308–10. On the relationship between literary and inscribed epigram, see e.g. the chapters by Day and Hunter in this volume.

⁷ On the propagandistic use of literary epigrams, see Giommoni's chapter in this volume.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE MATERIAL

Private compilations and ostraca offer unique insights into the everyday literary consumption and tastes of readers of Greek epigram, being by definition products of individuals' engagement with the genre. Unlike copies of poetic books of epigrams, with more or less fixed sequences of epigrams within sections and sequences of sections within books,⁸ private compilations often contain excerpts of poetry of various genres, and often from various periods. In all likelihood, these collections were not assembled by a skilled poet or by an editor who might have chosen to employ the structure of an anthology as a form of artistic expression.⁹ Instead, both the content and the structure of private compilations were guided by the interests, the tastes, and especially the needs of individuals, which in turn reflect their own engagement with, and use of, poetry.

This holds true in particular for the Hellenistic period, because from the third century BCE onwards we have at our disposal exceptionally rich evidence for this kind of enquiry: if we look at the chronological distribution of all papyrological evidence concerning Greek epigrams, it becomes evident that of the fifty-seven surviving papyri, ostraca, and tablets that contain epigrams, roughly a half (twenty-seven or twenty-eight, depending on the counting) come from the Hellenistic period.¹⁰ The numbers peak in the third and second centuries BCE, and then again in the first century CE, and this can perhaps be taken as a relatively reliable reflection of the historical dynamics of the production of epigrammatic collections, which, as we know from other sources, peak in the same periods.¹¹

One peculiarity of the textual tradition of Greek epigram is the relative richness of paraliterary sources stemming from the Hellenistic period: no less than seventeen out of the aforementioned twenty-seven or twenty-eight epigrammatic papyri, ostraca, and tablets known from the Hellenistic period belong to this class—that is, the class of epigrams found outside poetry books. In Table 3.1 I provide an overview of this material, listed by the Trismegistos (TM) number and followed by information concerning the first or the standard edition, the nature of the source (together with a sketch of the compilation's structure, where appropriate), the writing material, the provenance, and the date.

⁸ For a general discussion, see Krevans (1984) and Gutzwiller (1998); for the arrangement of the Posidippus papyrus, see Gutzwiller (2005a).

⁹ On this issue, see Krevans (1984).

¹⁰ The statistics are based primarily on searches through the LDAB = Leuven Database of Ancient Books, TM = Trismegistos (data platform), and Cr. = Cribiore (1996) and are limited to papyri, ostraca, and tablets from the fourth century BCE to the eighth century CE.

¹¹ Most papyri containing epigrams are dated to the third and second centuries BCE (nine and eleven of them respectively), and some (seven) to the first century CE. Statistics as described in n. 10 in this chapter.

Table 3.1 Overview of paraliterary sources that include epigrams

- 1) TM 59936 = CPP 0192 = Pordomingo 38 = Weil, *Un papyrus inédit*, 1–34 = Paris, Louvre 7171 + Paris, Louvre 7172 (P. Firmin-Didot); school text:¹² *comica adespotà* + Euripides + Aeschylus + comedy + Posidipp. 115–16 A–B; papyrus; Memphis, Saqqara, Serapeum; second century BCE.
- 2) TM 59942 = Guéraud/Jouguet, *Un livre d'écolier*, 1–45 = Cairo, Egyptian Museum JdE 65445 = Pordomingo 28; school text: syllabary + word list + literary anthology including epigrams (SH 978 and 979);¹³ papyrus; Arsinoites (Fayum ?); third century BCE.
- 3) TM 61302 = O. Wilcken 2 1488 = London, British Library O. 25736 = CPP 0391; school text: collection of the first lines of epigrams (an incipit list); ostrakon; Thebes (?); second century BCE.
- 4) TM 61580 = P. Freib. (Sitzb. Heid. Akad. 1914, 2) I 1b = Pordomingo 29; school text: Menander, *opus incertum* (CGFP 297); *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 213–14 ('epigram'); Homer, *Iliad* 5. 387–91; papyrus; Egypt, unknown provenance? second or first century BCE.
- 5) TM 65546 = O. Bodl. 2 2173 = Oxford, Ashmolean Museum Bodl. Gr. Inscr. 1205 = SH 971; school text: an epigram extolling Spartan virtue, possibly relating to king Agesilaus; ostrakon; Egypt; first century BCE.
- 6) TM 65548 = O. Bodl. 2 2172 = Oxford, Ashmolean Museum Bodl. Gr. Inscr. 930 = SH 971; school text: the epigram is identical to no. 5; ostrakon; Egypt; first century BCE.
- 7) TM 65597 = ZAS 28 (1890), 61–2 [4757] = Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum P. 4757 = SH 973; school text: an epigram on Homer's fatherland; ostrakon; Diospolis (Thebes east); second century BCE.
- 8) TM 65619 = P. Ryl. Gr. 3 499 = Manchester, John Rylands Library Gr. 499 = SH 987; unclear function; fragmentary elegiac verses, perhaps including an epigram or more (Gronewald in SH 987 recognizes a sepulchral epigram for a deceased poetess); papyrus; Egypt; second century BCE.
- 9) TM 65673 = Raccolta Lumbroso, 257–9 no. 3 = Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum P. 12309 = SH 975; a schoolchild's improvisation? an obscene pseudo-epitaph; ostrakon; Philadelphia (Gharabet el-Gerza); third or second century BCE.
- 10) TM 65674 = Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum P. 13270 = BKT 5.2, 56–63 no. XV = GLP no. 103 = Pordomingo 21; sympotic aide-memoire = *hypomnema*: three sympotic epigrams (or *skolia*), followed by a sympotic elegy; sheet; Elephantine; c.300 BCE.
- 11) TM 65682 = P. Cairo Zen. 4 59532 = Cairo, Egyptian Museum, Catalogue Général 59532 = SH 977; template for a stone mason: two epitaphs for Tauron, Zenon's hunting dog; papyrus; Philadelphia (Gharabet el-Gerza); third century BCE.
- 12) TM 65693 = *Hermathena* 80 (1952), 3–11 = Dublin, Trinity College Pap. F 90 = SH 997; literary text, unclear function (school improvisation?): fragments of a fictional sepulchral 'epigram' on the daughters of Lycambes, in catalectic iambic tetrameter; papyrus; Egypt; third century BCE.
- 13) TM 65698 = *Sitzb. Berl. Akad.* (1912), 547–50 = Hamburg, Bibliothek gr. 312 = SH 980; school exercise? epitaph on the poet Philicus; papyrus; Egypt; third century BCE.
- 14) TM 65775 = P. Hamb. 2 124 = Hamburg, Bibliothek gr. 666 Vo = GLP no. 106 = SH 957; unclear function: fragments of distichs on the origin of Rome (epigram or elegy? see the commentary to SH 957); papyrus; Egypt; third or second century BCE.
- 15) TM 65784 = *Le Monde grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux*, 537–48 + QUCC 19 (1975), 145–76 + ZPE 24 (1977), 1–12 = Paris, Louvre 7733 = CPP 0161 = SH 984; literary text; recto: philosophical treatise; verso: philological exegesis: epigram on an oyster, a riddle with commentary; papyrus; Memphis Serapeum; second century BCE.
- 16) TM 66251 = *Ancient Society* 8 (1977), 209–13 = Dublin, Trinity College Pap. F 134 = SSH 1191 = Pordomingo 22; sympotic aide-memoire = *hypomnema*? fragmentary sympotic

¹² See Pordomingo, p. 180.¹³ See discussion at pp. 44–9 in this volume.

epigram or a *skolion* in Anacreontic metre, ending with the lemma ἄλλο, possibly a private compilation; papyrus; Arsinoites (Fayum); third century BCE.

- 17) TM 217929 = *Eulimene* 10–12 (2009–11), 135–55; copying exercise (?): an erotic epigram in elegiac distichs; ostracon; Rhodes; third or second century BCE.¹⁴

3. LESSONS IN READING

From the overview of the evidence listed in Table 3.1 (and ignoring for a moment the ostraca and *incerta* while we focus on nos 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, and 16), it transpires that the surviving paraliterary papyri represent functional collections, compiled with a particular purpose in mind. As far as I can discern, there are three distinct functions these papyri served: (a) there are two papyri (nos 10 and 16) featuring sympotic epigrams that appear to have been used during symposia as aide-memoires;¹⁵ (b) there is a template for a sepulchral epigram for a dog that was meant, one assumes, for a stone mason's use (no. 11),¹⁶ and (c) there are several papyri that represented collections employed in a school context (nos 1, 2, and 4).

Needless to say, each of these three groups can be taken as indicative of contemporary interests and tastes in the contexts of performance, commemoration, and education. Starting with the aide-memoires, no. 10 is an intriguing example of a *symmeikton*,¹⁷ a compilation of various literary genres copied for personal use and assembled in accordance with personal taste. Since this papyrus sheet, one of the earliest extant literary papyri,¹⁸ belonged to a soldier (it was found at Elephantine, in the grave of a Greek soldier) and all of the poetry compiled therein clearly deals with sympotic themes,¹⁹ scholars from Wilamowitz onwards²⁰ have been keen to place it in a sympotic setting: on the papyrus, we read three *skolia* or sympotic epigrams introduced by the titles 'Muse' or 'Muses' (*ΜΟΥΣΑ(Ι)*²¹), 'Easy Pray' (*ΕΥΦΩΠΑΤ[ΟΝ?]*), and 'Mnem-osyne' (*ΜΝΗΜΟΣΥΝΗ*), followed by a poem in elegiacs written in *eisthesis* (indentation, that is, the text is shifted to the right of the notional left margin) and separated by a paragraph sign (—).²² The first of the three sympotic

¹⁴ I give here only elementary bibliographical guidance for individual papyri and ostraca; full bibliographical references for items on this list are to be found in the LDAB and BKT online (= Berliner Papyrusdatenbank (BerlPap) at <http://berlpap.smb.museum>). Both databases provide help with further bibliography.

¹⁵ See n. 2 in this chapter. On no. 10 and its sympotic context, see A. Petrovic (2007b), 103–4, with further bibliography.

¹⁶ For a recent new edition, with commentary, of this papyrus and for a review of the evidence concerning its function, see Pepper (2010), 608–15.

¹⁷ On *symmeikta* with respect to epigrams, see Gutzwiller (1998); Höschle (2010), 29–30.

¹⁸ On dating, see Pordomingo, pp. 163–4.

¹⁹ Cf. Pordomingo, pp. 166–8.

²⁰ Wilamowitz in BKT V.2, pp. 56–63.

²¹ See Kwapisz (2008).

²² Cf. BKT V.2, pp. 56–63; Pernigotti and Maltomini (2002), 67–75; Lulli (2009), 137–9.

epigrams or *skolia* is fragmentary; but the rest, including the poem that comprises five elegiac couplets, is not. Echoing to an extent Xenophanes (fr. B 1 D–K), the elegiacs lay down rules of conduct at a symposium and presuppose their performance in the sympotic setting: the voice addresses the *sympotae* ('fellow drinkers') and, speaking in first person plural, encourages them to engage in various activities.²³ Thus in the sheet from Elephantine we have a case of a personal anthology of literary texts that a soldier presumably selected himself, on the basis of their appropriateness to a specific context, and conceivably took with him at symposia.²⁴ Remarkable, therefore, is the fact that among our earliest literary papyri we find excerpted epigrams or *skolia*, accompanied by other pieces and quite possibly performed. A similar argument could be made for no. 16, a fragment of cartonnage dated to the first half of the third century BCE, on which individual poems, sympotic epigrams or *skolia*, are separated by the designation *ἄλλο* ('another').²⁵

From symposia we now move on to stones, and we will complete this survey in schools. Early paraliterary tradition implicating the performance of epigrams also intimates an early predilection for the epigrammatic art of variation. While we can only speculate as to what followed *ἄλλο* in the case of no. 16, the well-known couple of sepulchral epigrams (no. 11 = SH 977) for the brave young dog Tauron, written between 256 and 246 BCE, provides an interesting case of variation on a theme in two epigrams separated by *ἄλλο* and preserved on papyrus but destined, according to the commonly accepted conjecture, for stone.²⁶ On the generally accepted interpretation, the papyrus contains a letter sent by a poet to Zenon, an employee of Ptolemy's financial minister (*dioiketes*), Apollonius. While at Philadelphieia, Zenon, about whose life we incidentally know a fair deal, commissioned a skilled poet to compose an epitaph for his young dog, who had been killed by a boar while protecting his master during a hunt. The poet sent a letter (perhaps from Alexandria?)²⁷ with two elegant poems: one in elegiacs and another one in iambics.²⁸ In this

²³ GLP no. 103 (vv. 3, 7, 9) = Pordomingo no. 21. The question of the genre of these verses—elegy or epigram—is relevant, of course, but already in the early Hellenistic period there were no particular difficulties about treating texts of this length as sympotic epigrams. HedyI. HE 4 = Ath. 11.497d is a sympotic poem in five elegiacs that is contemporary with the text from the papyrus; and, as Bowie (2007) argues, texts of this kind were first performed at symposia before being published as a part of an (epigram) book. Regrettably, F. Cairns (2016) appeared too late to be taken fully into account here. I can only note that Francis Cairns has a different view on the context of HedyI. HE 4 (ibid., 106).

²⁴ See Bravo (1997), 43–6.

²⁵ Cf. Pordomingo no. 22, p. 169.

²⁶ On variation of this kind, see Fantuzzi (2010). For a discussion of function, papyrus quality, and script, see Pepper (2010), 608–12. Purola (1994), 62 recognizes topical motifs in the poems that should point towards the verses being a literary exercise; I do not share this view.

²⁷ On the poet's identity and the possible association of the Apollonius of this papyrus with Apollonius of P. Mich. I 77, see Pepper (2010), 608–9.

²⁸ On the art of variation in this papyrus, and generally on the epitaphs for dogs in Greek literature, see Garulli (2014a), esp. 47–54 and 52 for a convincing explanation of the differences in metre.

epigrammatic epistle, therefore, we find one of the earliest attestations of variation on a theme on papyri, a phenomenon well attested also in epigraphic evidence throughout the fourth century BCE, as both Marco Fantuzzi and Valentina Garulli have demonstrated.²⁹

The use of the term ἄλλο, ‘another (epigram)’, separating the two poems—both of which, with twelve and eleven lines respectively, have an exceptional length from the perspective of inscribed sepulchral epigrams of the classical and early Hellenistic period—seems to imply that the practice of variation and the grouping of epigrams on similar topics were part of the commissioning process: like buyers who may wish to purchase the same shirt in two different colours, commissioners could apparently expect to receive poems on the same topic in two different metres. Crucially, perhaps, the use of the separator ἄλλο in a letter to a commissioner reveals what we may call an *anthological impulse* on the part of the poet and indicates the existence, by the mid-third century BCE, of a well-established culture of production and reception geared towards sequential readings of epigrams—remarkably, also *outside* poetic books.³⁰

This specific mode of reading and the habit of reception were acquired at a young age, and this fact is revealed by the material associated with Hellenistic schools, where pupils encountered epigrams in sequences, be it in order to improve their mnemonics by learning them by heart or in order to improve their literacy by learning to write them in a sequence. In a nutshell, the taste for a sequential reading of epigrams was acquired through the curricula of Hellenistic schools, which trained young minds to read epigrams in series.

Jessica Wissmann astutely observed that, in the Hellenistic period, ‘epigrams were considered particularly suitable for use in school’,³¹ partly owing to their relative brevity, which facilitated quick copying exercises, and partly owing to their subject matter, which often included gnomological and (literary-)historical subjects. In fact school exercises in writing provide informative insights not only into the popularity and pedagogical suitability of epigram in a school context but also into the training that schoolchildren received in sequential epigrammatic reading and reception: a good example of such a practice is an ostrakon of the second century BCE (Diospolis, Egyptian Thebes, no. 7 = SH 973B), which preserves a schoolchild’s attempt to copy the text of an epigram on the subject of Homer’s fatherland.³² The ostrakon

²⁹ See Fantuzzi (2010); Garulli (2012).

³⁰ For early epigrammatic ‘mini-collections’ attested in authors of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, see A. Petrovic (2007a; 2013).

³¹ Wissmann (2010), 70. Wissmann’s observation there that epigrams disappear almost entirely from school papyri after the Hellenistic period is correct, but we still have some evidence for the presence of epigrams in schools, on ostraca, after the end of the Hellenistic period. See e.g. n. 33 in this chapter.

³² μὴ πεύθου τίς Ὁ[μ]ῆρος ἔφυ<γ> γένος· αἱ γὰρ ἅπασαι | εἵνεκ’ ἐμῆς δόξης φ[ασί] τεκεῖν με πόλεις. | ἄξιον αἰωνίσμα. [.....]· ἔστι γὰρ ἡμῇ | πατρίς Ὀδυσσεύς [γράμμα καὶ] Ἰλιάδος (‘Do not

contains a number of orthographic mistakes and deals with Homer's life, a popular topic of school epigrams,³³ but what is particularly striking is the heading that precedes the text of the epigram: ἄλλο.

The fact that a separator introduces the verses suggests that the pupil copying this epigram had some sort of model in front of him that must have contained more than one epigram, and in fact a papyrus with the remains of an epigrammatic anthology survives that contains this very epigram. This is *P. Freib. I 4* (inv. no. 10 recto, *SH* 973 = LDAB 4010 = TM 62820), which included more than four epigrams,³⁴ perhaps separated by introductory lemmas,³⁵ some of which deal with poets and artists (Homer is possibly the topic in more than one epigram).³⁶ An intriguing issue concerning the surviving papyrus is that, insofar as we can rely on palaeographic inferences, it is at least one century *younger* than the ostrakon. This, of course, does not mean that the poetic anthology, whatever its nature or function might have been, is itself younger than the preserved papyrus (especially since the epigrams are associated with the names of Theodoridas and Posidippus).³⁷

This brings us to another remarkable feature of schoolbook papyri that contain epigrams. When it comes to epigrams in Hellenistic schools, as Wissmann rightly underscores, there is a tendency to include poems by more or less contemporary poets,³⁸ the authors who became famed for their epigrammatic collections and anthologies. If, as some believe, the third-century BCE papyrus (no. 13 in Table 3.1) does reflect in part its use in a school context, then the epitaph for the poet Philicus that the papyrus includes could be indicative of great interest in contemporary epigrammatists within the

ask from which *genos* I, Homer, stem, since all the cities call me their offspring because of my fame. Worthy [.....]; for my fatherland is the letter of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*).

³³ Another example is TM 63685 = *O. Bodl. 2 2174* = Oxford, Ashmolean Museum Bodl. Gr. Inscr. 2105, Egypt, an ostrakon dating from the first century CE with a school exercise containing an epigram on Homer's fatherland and riddled with orthographic mistakes (= *SH* 972): Ζμυρναῖον σιγῶμι γένος πατερησεδομησε | λέξω Κυμαίων εμβα. ἐπ' αἰόνων | αστη Ἀθηναίης τ..σκαῖδ...ς πάνθ' ὑπὲρ ἄκρης. No. 4 from our table, TM 61580 = *P. Freib. I 1b* = Cr. 248, a second or first century BCE school book, contains the famous lines of the dedicatory epigram extrapolated from *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 213–14: Ἡσίοδος Μούσαις Ἑλικωνίσι τόνδ' ἀνέθηκεν | ὕμνω νικήσας ἐν Χαλκίδι θεῖον Ὅμηρον ('Hesiod dedicated this to the Heliconian Muses, having defeated in hymning the divine Homer'). For further literary sources for the same epigram, see Pordomingo no. 29, p. 208. On Homer as the subject of epigrams employed in schools in later periods, see Guichard (2017).

³⁴ Aly (1914), 58–9, col. I; Aly preserves the last words (or parts thereof) of no. 7.

³⁵ For what it is worth, Aly (1914), 58 prints [*Ποσειδίππου* before the last epigram of col. II. See also the remarks in the *SH* 973, p. 484 on the empty spaces in lines 16 and 25 of the papyrus: *inerat olim (iam dextrorsum abscissa) inscriptio (ἄλλο, poetae nomen, sim.)?*

³⁶ See *SH* 973, p. 484 for Wifstrand's interpretation of lines 1–3 of the papyrus as another epigram associated with Homer.

³⁷ For the attributions to Theodoridas and Posidippus, see *SH* 973, p. 485.

³⁸ See Wissmann (2002, 228–9; 2010, 69–70).

school setting.³⁹ Furthermore, we know that the language of contemporary epigrammatists provided a source of inspiration also for epigrammatic improvisations found on ostraca outside the educational context in the strictest sense of the word, such as the text attested on the ostrakon no. 9 from the Table 3.1.⁴⁰

This observation is important because school curricula influence literary tastes and determine generic expectations. In this sense, the use of ἄλλο in no. 7 intimates that sequential readings of epigrams were a part of the school education. The ostrakon listed under number 3 seems to confirm this suggestion: SH 976 is a second-century BCE opisthograph (a text written on both sides of the material) with six lines of text on each side, in two different hands, and containing the first verses of a number of epigrams. The ostrakon comes from a school context, represents a copying exercise, and five lines of the text are identical on both sides; in addition, one further line of an epigram is preserved on one face while it is missing on the other, and vice versa. We can identify the author of two of these poems as Leonidas of Tarentum,⁴¹ one of the greatest masters of the genre and an early author of a collection of book epigrams. What was the model from which the students were copying? An epigrammatic collection? An incipit list, akin to the Vienna incipit list?⁴²

One can only speculate as to whether the practice of reading sequential epigrams in schools is a likely explanation for the curious feature I noted on the ostraca nos 5 and 6, which preserve the text of one and the same epigram, and both stem from the school context. From what we can tell, the student who copied the text of the epigram on ostrakon no. 5 in the first century BCE also supplied an introductory lemma for the text and a title for the epigram that, it is argued, dealt with Agesilaus: 'On Sparta'.⁴³ What is less clear is

³⁹ One side of the papyrus contains a private letter, while the other contains the epigram, written with some skill but with traces of writing exercises throughout. The *Suda* places Philicus in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus and, since the papyrus itself comes from the third century BCE, we would have a relatively quick resonance of contemporary poets in a school context. See SH 980.

⁴⁰ The ostrakon carries an obscene pseudo-epitaph (*l'építaphe burlesque*, as Taillardat 1989, 205 calls it) for a boy named Clitorius (SH 975 = FGE anon. 97). Judging from the poem's pubescent tone and content, it might represent the reflex of a schoolboy's jesting improvisations. Nevertheless, both Livrea (1987) and Magnelli (1999) have detected its literary qualities and a certain degree of literary pretension—or, as Magnelli (1999), 105 puts it, *un autore non poi troppo 'barbaro', non del tutto privo di cultura letteraria e di padronanza della lingua*. The direct resonance of the language of contemporary epigrammatists in the epigrams attested on the ostraca is clear in the case of no. 17, which dates from the late third or early second century BCE; this, however, might represent either an attempt to copy an epigram by an established poet or an inspired impromptu draft. The editors of the new text suggest that it bears witness to intersections with Posidippus' and Callimachus' epigrammatic poetry and that it contains certain Asclepiadean echoes (Drelisios-Iraklidou and Litinas 2009–11, 135–55).

⁴¹ See Wissmann (2010), 70 and SH 976, p. 488.

⁴² On Leonidas, see Fantuzzi (2004), 289–90 and Gutzwiller (2007a), 110–18. On the Vienna Epigrams Papyrus (*G 40611*), see Parsons, Maehler, and Maltomini (2015).

⁴³ Cf. SH 971 ad loc.

whether the decision to write the lemma was the pupil's own or whether the pupil followed the text of the model he was copying: in the text of the same epigram on the poorly preserved ostrakon no. 6, the lemma seems to be missing.⁴⁴ But it seems evident that, by including the lemma, the pupil who copied the text of no. 5 demonstrates an anthological impulse reminiscent of the one we could identify in the case of Zenon's commission (no. 11).

4. LESSONS IN IDEOLOGY

With this in mind, let me turn to schoolbooks proper. The most famous Hellenistic school anthology,⁴⁵ a handbook that is likely to have belonged to a teacher⁴⁶ but came to be widely known under the misnomer *un livre d'écolier* ('a student's book'), survives on a papyrus of unclear provenance (reportedly, but uncertainly, from Fayum) and is dated to the late third century BCE (no. 2 in Table 3.1). This much discussed papyrus⁴⁷ consists of a syllabary with a word list and a lengthy literary anthology. The handbook was meant to provide material for a comprehensive education and its structure corresponds to the intended gradual progression of the students, as it starts with exercises aiming at the acquisition of basic reading and writing skills and ends with segments of poetry of considerable literary pretension and featuring complex lexical and grammatical matters.

The literary anthology comprises sections from Euripides' *Phoenician Women* 529–34 and *Ino* fragment 420 Nauck², Homer's *Odyssey* 5. 116–24, two epigrams (*SH* 978–9), and three lengthy fragments from New Comedy (*CGFP* 289 a and b = *PCG* VII 1072 and 1073 and *CGFP* 219 = Strato Com. *Phoenicides* = *PCG* VII Strato). The literary material that precedes the segment with the epigrams is largely suitable for lower educational levels, and the excerpts demonstrate pedagogic interest in ethical education, as they offer moral maxims and instructions for life: Jocasta advises Eteocles not to strive for *philotimia* ('love of honour', 'honour', and 'distinction'), and the fragment

⁴⁴ Ostrakon no. 6 is now lost, but the available reports indicate that it does not seem to have included the lemma. Its orthography was garbled and ridden with all sorts of mistakes, so that Lloyd-Jones and Parsons noted, in their commentary to *SH* 971, *textum in 2172 non mutilum sed corruptum* (p. 482). For speculations about the pupil's model, see also Wissmann (2002), 219.

⁴⁵ That is, the most famous of the five (or six) collections that we can identify as school anthologies with some degree of certainty; three of these are associated with the 'Clitorius archive' and two are found elsewhere. For an overview, see Pordomingo nos 25–9, pp. 181–208, and her general remarks on issues of identification in the introduction (p. 181), and on no. 38 in her anthology (= no. 1 in Table 3.1).

⁴⁶ Its quality and structure suggest that it was in fact a schoolmaster's copy used for teaching at different levels, as Cribiore (1996) observes on 379.

⁴⁷ For an overview of literature, see Pordomingo no. 28, esp. pp. 191–2.

from *Ino* deals with sudden changes in fortunes; Calypso deplores the cruelty and envy of gods and instructs on the disadvantages of sharing a bed with them. The two epigrams, however, do not deal with gods or the acquisition of virtue and avoidance of depravity but, as we shall see, with events from the students' present day: Ptolemaic benefactions and the cultural developments brought about by the monarchy. The two epigrams are grouped together on the roll, but unfortunately, since the section of the papyrus containing the beginning of *SH* 979 is missing, one cannot tell whether the text of *SH* 979 was introduced with a particular lemma containing the title or the separator *ἄλλο*. Either alternative is possible, since the addressees of both epigrams are members of the royal family and⁴⁸ the genre of the epigrams (and, to an extent, their content) is similar. But the main reason why it seems likely that *SH* 979 was introduced by a lemma is that such a practice is attested in another anthology, which—possibly—derives ultimately from school practices. This is no. 1 in my list.⁴⁹

Significantly, the epigrams are placed in the part of the anthology that was obviously intended for advanced students, as this section of the handbook includes no reading aids. The epigrams were intended to be read, copied, and memorized at higher levels, in all likelihood as part of the school curriculum at levels six, seven, and further up, according to Cribiore's classification of educational levels in Hellenistic schools, and were meant as 'good stepping-stones for children of the elite'.⁵⁰

Such an education programme for the elite, however, covered not only instruction in literature and modes of epigrammatic reading but also instruction in royal and imperial ideology, which was instilled through literary education. In this sense, the two epigrams are highly remarkable in terms of their subject matter and literary ambition. They are both dedicatory in nature

⁴⁸ Possibly Arsinoe III (or Berenice II) and Ptolemy IV, but this identification is not universally accepted; some have argued in favour of Arsinoe II. See *SH* 978, pp. 491–2, and Pordomingo, p. 199 with n. 589.

⁴⁹ The papyrus is dated to the first half of the second century BCE and is considered to represent (in part) a school anthology to which the owners of the papyrus added further texts themselves: *GLP* 104 a–b (comedy; *E. Med.* 5–12; fr. from *A. Cares = Europa; comica adespota*; and two epigrams attributed to Posidippus, namely *HE* 11 = 115 A–B and *HE* 12 = 116 A–B). The scroll is written in part by a professional scribe and in part by two students and brothers, Ptolemy and Apollonius. Apollonius also wrote down the word *ἄλλο*, separating the two epigrams explicitly attributed to Posidippus and thus—to paraphrase Peter Bing (2009), 206—almost mechanically adopting editorial practices typical of anthologies. This is precisely what students tended to do: in no. 7 we have already found an epigram on an ostrakon introduced by *ἄλλο*, and in no. 5 we have found another, on an ostrakon coming from the first-century BCE Thebes and concerning a Spartan soldier. Some have argued that Apollonius wrote the epigrams from memory; on these issues, see D. J. Thompson (1987), 105–21; Parsons (2002), 109–10; Bing (2009), 194–203 (and 206–7 on *ἄλλο*).

⁵⁰ Cribiore (2001), 38–9 (quotation at 39).

⁵⁴ That is, either of the king and queen or, alternatively, of the queen and the nymphs; see the commentary to this line in *SH*.

fatherland or the glorious deeds of ancient kings, the epigrams from the handbook praise the accomplishments of the dynasts of the land, and with regard to tone, moral instruction, and content, stand apart from the literary passages that precede the epigrams' section. However, in their handling of benefactions, the two epigrams from the teacher's handbook find parallels in two epigrams attested in the only other (potential, but not certain) school anthology of the Hellenistic period that includes epigrams. This is the Firmin-Didot Papyrus (*P. Louvre* 7171 and 7172; no. 1 in Table 3.1),⁵⁵ which includes two epigrams attributed to Posidippus, both of which extol cultural achievements under the Ptolemies: one epigram deals with the dedication of the lighthouse on Pharos (or, somewhat less likely, of a statue at its top), and another one with the dedication of a temple for Arsinoe Aphrodite Zephyritis (115 and 116 A–B, respectively).⁵⁶

Both handbooks (nos 1 and 2), then, include epigrams that instil in students an appreciation of the civilizing force represented by the royal house, the force that transforms Egyptian landscapes into landscapes inhabited by cults of Greek poets and divinities, the force that saves people from perils by quenching their thirst on sun-scorched land and by guiding them to safety on stormy seas.⁵⁷ That said, while *SH* 979, with its references to the Ptolemies' dedication of a temple to Homer, is by and large a fitting subject for advanced students, the language and imagery of *SH* 978 might appear less suitable, at least on a first reading. It has been repeatedly observed that *SH* 978, dealing as it does with a fountain house with statues of a Ptolemy and (an) Arsinoe,⁵⁸ is a curiously difficult text—or, to quote Wissmann, is 'over-fraught with the technical language of architecture'.⁵⁹ Indeed, it seems almost cruel on the teacher's part to have requested that students engage with such an epigram, let alone to have imagined these texts being learned by heart: dry technical terms abound and the author of the epigram demonstrates an impressive capacity in architectural ecphrasis, and more than a superficial connection with stonework.

On the other hand, there could be more in *SH* 978, in terms of an ideological message, than initially meets the eye. The language, while painstakingly technical, also contains a number of words attested in both

⁵⁵ See n. 12 here and Pordomingo no. 38.

⁵⁶ On both of these epigrams, see Bing (1998), 22–7 and 30–1. In this anthology, too, the epigrams stand out in terms of their subject matter and function by comparison to the rest of the literary texts.

⁵⁷ On Arsinoe Aphrodite's exceptional connection to water in Ptolemaic royal ideology, see the excellent investigation by Barbantani (2005), 142–52.

⁵⁸ That it is both of them is intimated by v. 12 (εἰκόνα δ' ὑμετέρην, 'your image', plural) and to a lesser extent by v. 3; but see *SH* 978, p. 492 (ὑμετέρην . . . *non ad reges respicit, sed ad nymphas*, "yours" refers not to the kings but to the nymphs'). See Barbantani (2005).

⁵⁹ Wissmann (2010), 69.

Asclepiades and Posidippus, and scholars have pointed out the parallels between the last line of that epigram and the poem ascribed to Posidippus on the temple of Arsinoe Aphrodite (*HE* 12 = 116 A–B). In fact some have argued in favour of Posidippean authorship of *SH* 978,⁶⁰ and nobody will doubt that the author of the poem is a poet of considerable skill. Furthermore, the praise of the Ptolemies' euergetism is evident in *SH* 979, and perhaps we should recognize a similar topic in *SH* 978, too—namely a topic that extends beyond the obvious assertion that building a public fountain is an act of euergetism on its own.

In a nutshell, could it be that the description of the fountain also harbours ideologically charged messages concerning the ideals of sociopolitical order in the Ptolemaic kingdom towards the end of the third century BCE? What is there to gain by reading the ecphrasis of the fountain as an architectural allegory of the good order (*eunomia*, v. 15) in the Ptolemaic kingdom? Over the past years, and due to the contributions by Susan Stephens, Peter Bing, and Ivana Petrovic, our knowledge of Hellenistic geopoetics has increased considerably.⁶¹ Bing has pointed out how the diverse provenance of stones in Posidippus' *Lithika* (*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII* 309) exemplifies Ptolemaic territorial aims and pretensions through their geographical distribution and social constructions, and Petrovic demonstrated how narratives about the origin of stones mirror a particular type of court ideology attested in the Achaemenid royal inscriptions, namely the ideology of universal rule, in which the court and the monarch represent the kingdom by attracting riches and wonders from all of its parts.⁶² In *SH* 978, too, we might be tempted to recognize a similar technique, a technique by which issues of ethnicity, race, and unity of the entire empire are being tackled through the composition of the building materials: white building materials come from Hymettus, hence from Attica and, by extension, from 'Old Greece', and from Paros, hence from the islands; the black materials come from Syene, which would be Aswan in the south of Egypt. They all come together to form a uniquely complex life-giving fountain, which houses a royal image in its centre. Could this epigram, then, represent a veiled statement about the ideals of racial and sociopolitical fibre in Ptolemaic society, a statement of infinitely greater ideological import for young minds than the anatomy of a fountain house?

On such a reading, the central position of Arsinoe⁶³ would represent the focal point and the unifying force within the ideological architecture of the fountain—that is, of the empire—the force that vouchsafes the harmony of heterogeneous elements, which in turn results in prosperity for the people. The message is that Egypt is now 'where it's at': that it is Egypt transformed, as

⁶⁰ For parallels and for ascription, see Pordomingo, p. 199 (with bibliography).

⁶¹ See Stephens (2004); Bing (2005), 119–20; I. Petrovic (2014).

⁶² Bing (2005); I. Petrovic (2014), *passim*.

⁶³ *SH* 978, v. 13.

it were, through processes of multicultural slotting, twisting, and blending in which the Ptolemies provide public access to the power and prosperity that is water, just as the Pharaohs had done by taming the Nile, once upon a time.

As we have seen, epigrams about Homer are often found in educational anthologies, and these are all concerned with his biography (his birthplace, the *certamen* with Hesiod, etc.). Our SH 979 places Homer in Egypt, thanks to the building effort of the Ptolemies. Not only is Homer now at home in Egypt but, what is more, he is uniquely and firmly connected to the royal house, as he received a precinct thanks to the Ptolemies. In fact Ptolemy IV and Homer are praised in one breath, and Ptolemy is even extolled for his devotion to the Muses (v. 7, which also evinces a parallel between Homer, the best poet, and Ptolemy IV, the best man in war and in the art of the Muses). Thus SH 979 modifies an epigram on a standardized school topic to include the praise of Ptolemies as well: the advanced students engaging with this pair of epigrams will not need to wonder wherefrom Homer comes and what city birthed him. For under the reign of the Ptolemies, ‘the benefactors of mankind’ (SH 979, v. 6), the attracting power of the kingdom managed to set even Homer in his rightful place—namely in the Alexandrian library and in the Egyptian temple.

5. CONCLUSION

When we take a synoptic look at the epigrammatic evidence from paraliterary papyri, several general tendencies can be worked out. First, in terms of genres attested on the papyri and ostraca, we note the prevalence of the traditional epigrammatic genres: dedicatory and sepulchral. In terms of topics, two strands can be identified. One is that of epigrams dealing with the personae of poets and artists—mostly the poets of old, although we note a relatively quick response to the epigrammatic production of contemporary poets. The second strand of topics, which is attested in handbooks rather than in exercises, clearly conveys the importance of disseminating Ptolemaic ideology, instilled through the portrayals of cityscapes: a fountain, temples for Homer and Arsinoe, a lighthouse.

Crucially, perhaps, both ostraca and school anthologies, together with Zenon’s private commission, show a predilection for the pairing of epigrams, be it in the form of variations on a topic or groupings of epigrams with similar topics. It seems likely, therefore, that from very early on Hellenistic schools trained young minds for sequential readings, a practice that in turn resulted in an interplay between taste and production. Put simply, the pupils learned to read epigrams in sequence because poets composed epigrams with

sequences in mind, while poets composed epigrams in sequence because readers expected to read them in this fashion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the audiences in London, Stanford, and Münster for their contributions and suggestions; thanks are also due to the editors of this volume for their suggestions and criticism, and especially to Enrico Magnelli and Ivana Petrovic for a number of comments and suggestions and to Courtney Evans for polishing the English. I have profited a great deal from the comments, critique, and suggestions of the anonymous readers. The abbreviations of the epigraphic material follow the *SEG*; papyrological references follow the Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets (<http://papyri.info/docs/checklist>).

A Garland of Freshly Grown Flowers

The Poetics of Editing in Philip's *Stephanos*

Regina Höschele

About a century and a half after the publication of Meleager's *Stephanos*,¹ Philip of Thessalonica set out to pick a new harvest of epigrammatic flowers that had blossomed in the meantime, weaving them together with his poems into a garland of his own. As Philip's proem, whose vegetal imagery echoes that of his predecessor (AP 4.1 = HE 1), asserts, he plaited his garland *in rivalry with* Meleager's: ἀντανέπλεξα | τοῖς Μελεαγρείοις ὥς ἕκλον στεφάνοις (AP 4.2.3–4 = GPh 1.3–4).² While this explicit mention of his model clearly announces that Philip will emulate Meleager, not slavishly imitate him, his words have served only to confirm the negative view held by many modern critics, who have been quick to dismiss Philip as a *perpetuus imitator Meleagri*,³ a 'second-rate dealer in second-hand materials'.⁴ And, indeed, the overall scarcity of publications on Philip's *Garland* suggests that, to a large extent, scholars have not deemed it worthy of a closer look.⁵

¹ On the date of Meleager's *Garland*, see A. Cameron (1993), 49–56. Against the common dating of Philip's collection to c.40 CE (e.g. Hillscher 1892, 405–31; Cichorius 1922, 341–65; Gow and Page 1968, 1: xlv–xlix), compare A. Cameron (1980) = Cameron (1993), 56–65, who convincingly argues for a date c.53 CE or later.

² On the garland motif in Meleager, see Cox (1988), 109–25; Guichard (2000); Höschele (2010), 171–94. On Philip's proem, see Magnelli (2006) and, with particular attention to the novelty of Philip's undertaking vis-à-vis Meleager, Höschele (2017).

³ Thus Passow (1827), 3 and Weigand (1845a), 167. Similarly Beckby (1965), 237: *Dieser ahmt, wie er selbst gesteht, Meleagros nach, und zwar sklavisch* ('He imitates Meleager, as he himself confesses, and he does so slavishly').

⁴ Gow and Page (1968), 2: 329.

⁵ More recently scholars have started to show interest in Philip's *Garland*, in particular in its Roman elements, though contributions remain few and far between; see e.g. Bowie (2008); Cogitore (2010); Whitmarsh (2011); Pelliccio (2014; 2017). Several chapters in this volume, such as those of Campbell, Harder, Kanellou, and Tueller, also deal with Philippan epigrams from a variety of perspectives.

Ironically, Philip's statement about the likeness of his own work to the first *Stephanos* also contributed to a widespread and long-lasting misconception regarding the latter's arrangement. In a marginal note to Meleager's proem, the Palatine lemmatist J characterized its organization as *κατὰ στοιχεῖον*, that is 'in alphabetical order' according to the initial letter of each poem. Even though not the slightest trace of such an ordering is to be found in the sections of the *Palatine Anthology* that have been identified as deriving from Meleager,⁶ numerous scholars gave credence to this testimony by way of a curious logical leap. For, contrary to the Meleagrean passages, the Philippan sequences are manifestly organized alphabetically, and so Philip's self-avowed imitation of Meleager was taken as proof of the original alphabetization of the first *Garland*.⁷ To be sure, already Reitzenstein refuted the lemmatist's claim⁸ and Radinger well illustrated that Meleager ordered the poems on the basis of two principles that do not involve alphabetization: (1) in each section epigrams of one or two prominent poets are taken as a *Grundstock* ('basis') around which texts by other authors are arranged that (2) deal with identical or related themes.⁹ At the same time, however, these two scholars had little appreciation for Philip's technique, which Reitzenstein characterizes as *plump* ('coarse'),¹⁰ while Radinger implicitly dismisses it as 'insipid and unimaginative' in his praise of Meleager's (non-alphabetic) ensemble: *Ich habe den geistreichen, phantasievollen Dichter Meleagros nie für fähig gehalten, eine so geist- und phantasievolle Anordnung für den Stephanos gewählt zu haben* ('I have never deemed Meleager, this ingenious and imaginative poet, capable of having chosen such an insipid and unimaginative arrangement for the *Stephanos*').¹¹

As Alan Cameron plausibly argued, Meleager divided his *Stephanos* into four books that contained respectively *erotica*, *epitumbia*, *anathematica*, and *epideictica*.¹² Building upon his observations, Kathryn Gutzwiller brilliantly explored the intricate design of Meleager's anthology.¹³ So far, no comparable

⁶ For a helpful overview of how to 'reconstruct' the two *Garlands* from their remains, see Argentieri (2007). The first to look for traces of these collections was Passow (1827), and he was followed by Weigand (1845a; 1845b; 1847); see also Weisshäupl (1889, 2–25; 1896). The sequences left intact by Cephalas are analysed in Lenzinger (1965). Against alphabetical traces in Meleager, see A. Cameron (1993), 20–1.

⁷ Thus Jacobs (1798), xliii: *Iam ex hac imitationis professione merito colligas, Philippum etiam in disponendis carminibus ordinem a Meleagro probatum adoptasse* ('Already from this confession of imitation one may infer justly that Philip has also adopted the order favoured by Meleager in organizing the poems'). So, too, e.g. Passow (1827), 3; Weigand (1845a), 167; Weisshäupl (1889), 1 n. 1; even Beckby (1965), 70, still believes in an alphabetical organization, even though he was well aware of arguments to the contrary.

⁸ Reitzenstein (1893), 276.

⁹ Radinger (1895), 100–7. For thematic links between poems in Meleager's *Garland*, see also Wifstrand (1926), 14–29.

¹⁰ Reitzenstein (1907), 105.

¹¹ Radinger (1895), 106 n. 1.

¹² See A. Cameron (1968, 324–31; 1993, 19–33).

¹³ See Gutzwiller (1998), 276–322.

study of Philip's *Garland* exists. Is this because Philip truly was a second-rate imitator, who miserably failed to match his model's subtlety? Or is it because the vestiges of his *Garland* do not allow us to draw significant conclusions about its original layout? As we shall see, getting a sense of its arrangement is indeed fraught with more difficulty, precisely because of its alphabetization. Nonetheless, much remains to be said about Philip's editorial technique and his poetics of editing. Very importantly, Cameron recognized that Philip did not present the epigrams in a purely mechanical manner: 'The grouping of poems by initial letter was merely a preliminary, the external framework of his system. It was Philip's variation on Meleager's preliminary division of material into four basic categories before addressing himself to the more subtle task of arranging the individual poems inside those categories. Philip too had an internal *and* an external system.'¹⁴ In other words, just as individual epigrammatists, including Philip himself,¹⁵ frequently vary poems by earlier writers, so Philip's anthology constitutes a macrovariation of sorts on the first *Garland*.

While Cameron notes various thematic links within specific sections, he does not offer a systematic study of the whole. Within the confines of this chapter I shall not be able to give a comprehensive analysis either.¹⁶ I would, however, like to present some general thoughts on the artfulness of Philip's design, illustrated on the basis of select examples, and reflect on the various forms of concatenation both within individual sections and throughout the anthology. While an alphabetical ordering in and of itself may strike us as mechanical and potentially tedious, it does not preclude additional and subtler modes of arrangement: the alphabet just provides, to use Cameron's words, an *external framework* within which Philip was free to connect poems through verbal or thematic links, just as Meleager had done.

In opting for this organization, Philip in fact faced a greater challenge than his predecessor, as he could only group together poems with the same (or, possibly, subsequent) initial letters, which considerably limited his choices for the creation of thematic subgroups. This self-imposed formal constraint adds, I submit, to the artistry of Philip's enterprise and makes his achievement all the more remarkable. We might compare the voluntary implementation of technical difficulties in the composition of ancient *technopaignia*, broadly defined,¹⁷ such as Nestor of Laranda's lipogrammatic *Iliad*, each of whose twenty-four books was written entirely without the letter corresponding to its number (i.e. no alphas in Book 1, no betas in Book 2, etc.).¹⁸ As a modern counterpart, consider the poetic principles embraced by Oulipo (L'Ouvroir de

¹⁴ A. Cameron (1993), 40.

¹⁵ On Philip's variation technique, see Höschel (2016).

¹⁶ A detailed structural analysis will form part of a monograph I prepare on Philip's *Garland*.

¹⁷ The word *technopaignion* is often used with exclusive reference to figural poems, but ancient authors engage in many types of formal play, which we may, with Luz (2010), describe with the same term.

¹⁸ See Ma (2007b).

Littérature Potentielle), an association of writers established in 1960 with the aim of producing literature under technical constraints. A prominent example of Oulipian writing is George Perec's detective novel *La Disparition* (1969), which includes not a single instance of the letter 'e', while self-consciously recounting the search for a missing person with the wittily meaningful name Anton Voyl (*voyelle atone*). The group's self-definition memorably equates its members with rats 'who must construct the labyrinth from which they plan to escape'.¹⁹ Although Philip's letter game is of a somewhat different kind, it may well be characterized as Oulipian *avant la lettre*, with the *Garland's* alphabetical organization functioning as a self-constructed maze.

The epigrams' distribution across twenty-four parts corresponding to the letters of the alphabet recalls the structure of Homer's epics, whose division into twenty-four songs had long been established by the time of the *Garland's* composition.²⁰ Indeed, Philip's epigrammatic *kosmos* was, I submit, designed to span everything, from alpha to omega,²¹ in playful counterpoint to Homer's poems, which were considered all-encompassing, a universal source of knowledge.²² The epic touch with which Philip endowed his poetic enterprise is likewise reflected in its explicit association with *kleos*. For in presenting his addressee as familiar with the 'glory of older poets', that is, those assembled in the first *Garland* (παλαιοτέρων εἰδὼς κλέος, AP 4.2.5 = GPh 1.5), Philip aligns the commemorative function of Meleager's collection with epic's bestowal of heroic *kleos*; this is something that Philip himself evidently hopes to achieve for a new generation of epigrammatists: γνῶθι καὶ ὀπλοτέρων τῇν ὀλιγοστιχίην ('get to know also the *oligostichia* [brief poems] of younger authors', v. 6).²³

In arranging their poetic output, Philip, like Meleager, faced the difficult task of constructing thematic groupings with preexisting material; the creation of meaningful collocations was, however, facilitated by Philip's combination of excerpted texts with poems of his own. As Albert Wifstrand noted, the

¹⁹ See Lescure (1973), 36: *Oulipiens: rats qui ont à construire le labyrinthe dont ils se proposent de sortir*.

²⁰ The first reference to a Homeric book by letter dates to the second century BCE; see Richardson (1993), 20–1. While some have cast doubt on the view that the division must be post-Homeric (see Heiden 2000, with further references), the labeling of books by letters is most likely an Alexandrian product. Whatever its precise origin, there can be no doubt that Philip and his contemporaries encountered the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as we know them, each in twenty-four books.

²¹ My monograph will show how the epigrams of Philip's *Garland* map the entire Roman empire.

²² See Zeitlin (2001), 205 and F. Williams (1978), 87–9 on Homer as Oceanus, from which everything flows.

²³ So also Magnelli (2006), 400 n. 33. Epigram, of course, has always been closely associated with *kleos*, as inscriptional poetry served various commemorative purposes; Svenbro (1988), 72, labels it *une machine à produire du kléos* ('a *kleos*-making machine'). The anthology is thus presented as doing for epigrammatists what individual epigrams do for their subjects. On the meaning of *oligostichia* in Philip's preface, see Höschele (2017), 9–14; Pelliccio (2017).

poet-editor routinely begins variations with the same letter as their models, so as to be able to juxtapose the two.²⁴ This observation, casually made in a footnote, inspired Erhard Hirsch to analyse Philip's *Flechtweise* ('weaving technique') in a fascinating article of 1966, which remained, however, largely unnoticed owing to its obscure venue of publication, the East German *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Halle*.²⁵ Hirsch in fact anticipates many of the conclusions independently reached in 1968 by Cameron, who only came across Hirsch's article later on. While his attempts to (partially) reconstruct Philip's collection may occasionally go too far, Hirsch showed a much greater understanding of and appreciation for its design than previous scholars. And, even if his article is somewhat schematic, in that it provides long lists of related poems that stand together (or presumably once did) without delving more deeply into the effects of such textual collocation, it is, together with Cameron's analysis, an indispensable starting point for any engagement with Philip's poetics of editing.

Before presenting my own thoughts on the subject, let me briefly recapitulate the difficulties involved in examining the *Garland's* layout. We do not, after all, have immediate access to the two *Stephanoi* but are dealing with remains that resulted from a process of multiple anthologization. The vestiges are significant enough to give us a sense of their originals, but they do not permit a full-scale reconstruction of either collection. The Meleagrean sequences have been left basically unaltered: with the exception of the *erotica*, which Cephalas divided into heterosexual and pederastic material (now in Books 5 and 12 of the *AP*),²⁶ the epigrams therein still reflect the ensemble created by Meleager. For Cephalas, even if he might have skipped over individual poems, did not rearrange the texts:²⁷ since Meleager's *Stephanos* was divided into four parts, each devoted to another subgenre, Cephalas could easily appropriate whole sequences.

Not so in the case of Philip's *Garland*. As Hirsch and Cameron have demonstrated, his collection did not encompass several thematically different books, each organized alphabetically, but epigrams of all types were intermingled in *one* continuous alphabetical series.²⁸ Since the second *Stephanos*

²⁴ See Wifstrand (1926), 67 n. 2.

²⁵ Hirsch (1966), 401–2 counts seventeen instances of Philippan variations beginning with the same letter as their model, plus two pairs starting with subsequent letters. See also A. Cameron (1993), 40–2.

²⁶ See Wifstrand (1926), 8–22. On Cephalas' erroneous classifications of pederastic poems as heterosexual and vice versa, see A. Cameron (1993), 241–2.

²⁷ An important parallel is Cephalas' linear excerption of epigrams from Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the Philosophers*: as Weisshäupl (1889), 34–8 has shown, the poems at *AP* 7.83–133 appear in the same order as they do in the *Bioi*; cf. also A. Cameron (1993), 37–8.

²⁸ See Hirsch (1966), 405–9 and A. Cameron (1993), 33–5, who refutes Birt's (1882, 388–9) theory that the sequence of epideictic epigrams at *AP* 9.215–312 constitutes a complete book from Philip's *Garland*.

comprised between 3,000 and 4,000 verses, this series probably spanned several book rolls,²⁹ but the alphabet ran across any potential book divisions. Here too, Cephala excerpted epigrams in a linear manner, but—and this is a crucial difference—he had to distribute the texts among his books according to subject matter. This, unfortunately, means that no Philippan sequence entirely preserves its original state: an epigram starting with alpha that appears in Book 5 of the *AP* may thus have stood next to an alpha epigram now in Book 6, 7, or 9 and so on.

In addition, numerous poems attributed to Philippan authors (and therefore presumably excerpted from the *Garland*) are preserved out of sequence, that is, in sections that contain epigrams from various sources arranged according to Cephala's own principles.³⁰ While it is easy to identify such 'isolated' texts as Philippan, if they come from authors who are named in the *Garland*'s preface or whose other epigrams appear in the main alphabetical sequences,³¹ there are several authors and *adespota* outside of these blocks that may or may not have been included by Philip.³² But, even if it is impossible to determine the exact number of poems, or lines, transmitted via the *Palatina* and *Planudea*, there is a significant amount of indisputably Philippan material that allows us to examine his editorial technique.

If Philip had arranged the texts in fully alphabetized order (as is standard in modern-day lexica and dictionaries),³³ we could take the epigrams from their current positions and effortlessly restore their original sequence. But such a strict procedure would not have allowed for the creation of artful ensembles. Rather, by limiting the alphabetization to the first letter,³⁴ Philip was free to combine epigrams within letter groups just as he wished. Judging from their remains, the twenty-four sections were *not* of equal length: while alpha, epsilon, and eta epigrams, taken together, account for over a third of the transmitted material, other sections comprise only a handful of epigrams³⁵ (even if we must reckon with textual losses throughout, it is likely that the

²⁹ As we do not know how many poems have been lost and cannot always determine whether an author was included in the *Garland* or not, it is impossible to give a precise number. A. Cameron (1993), 34, counts around 3,000 surviving lines; Hirsch (1966), 405–6, reckons there are over 4,000.

³⁰ On Cephala's procedure in anthologizing epigrams, see A. Cameron (1993), 121–59.

³¹ There are eleven alphabetical sequences that contain 334 epigrams, while another 200–50 epigrams are transmitted in other parts of the *AP*; see Gow and Page (1968), 1: xii–xiii. From the thirty-nine authors securely attributed to Philip's *Garland*, only thirteen are named in its preface (*ibid.*, 1: xxi).

³² On 'doubtful claimants', see *ibid.*, 1: xxi–xxviii.

³³ On alphabetization in antiquity, see Daly (1967). The earliest examples of full alphabetization, Galen's *Interpretation of the Hippocratic Glosses* and Harpocration's *Lexicon of the Ten Orators*, date to the second century CE.

³⁴ See A. Cameron (1993), 37–9.

³⁵ Out of c.680 poems, 117 start with alpha, 72 with epsilon, and 68 with eta; the shortest sections are zeta (5), xi (5), and rho (4).

proportions between longer and shorter sequences were more or less the same). What, then, were the principles of Philip's arrangement, what kind of interwoven patterns would the ancient reader have encountered in a linear perusal?³⁶

Gow and Page attempted to envision Philip's *modus operandi* in excerpting and organizing the epigrams but were left completely puzzled by the evidence, concluding: 'The confusion on his table and in his mind can be imagined; what we cannot imagine is a plausible reason for adopting such a procedure.'³⁷ But is it truly so hard to see some method in what they took for madness? No matter how Philip went about collecting and sorting his material, the result was anything but random. Even if we are not able to reconstruct the original fully, it is still possible to perceive thematic subgroups both within and across current alphabetical sequences. In other words, not only are there clear signs of patterning among adjacent poems but, following Hirsch and Cameron, we can also plausibly speculate about links between texts that now stand in different books or different parts of the same book. Overall, we may, I suggest, distinguish between several modes of concatenation at a micro- and macrotextual level:

- (1) juxtaposition of model and copy,
- (2) collocation of poems that are thematically, structurally, or verbally linked without being direct variations of one another,
- (3) subtler modes of interweaving, for example through intertextual connections,
- (4) pairs or series of poems on the same theme distributed across the collection,
- (5) the occurrence of specific key themes within individual letter groups.

Let us turn, then, to some examples, beginning with the combination of copy and model (Category 1). In several instances Philip took advantage of the fact that previous variations on a theme happened to start with the same letter,³⁸ such as Quintus Maecius' and Crinagoras' epigrams on a statue of Eros bound (*AP* 198 = *GPh* 11 and *AP* 199 = *GPh* 50: *κλαῖε/καί*) or Antiphilus' and Bianor's epigrams on an octopus that lands on a rabbit after being hurled into the air by a fisherman (*AP* 9.14 = *GPh* 30

³⁶ On the linear reading of epigram and other poetry books in antiquity with theoretical reflections on the relation between individual poems and the collection as a whole, see Höschele (2010), esp. 8–68. More broadly, one might situate this approach to ancient poetry books within the framework of intratextual readings—for which see Sharrock and Morales (2000); Frangoulidis and Harrison (2018).

³⁷ Gow and Page (1968), 1: xviii.

³⁸ As Hirsch (1966), 409–10 points out, the tendency to start variations with the same initial or incipit is already manifest in earlier poets, whose epigrams were included in Meleager's collection.

and AP 9.227 = *GPh* 8: αἰγιαλοῦ/ἀκταίην).³⁹ By juxtaposing such variations, Philip makes their intertextuality visible on the written page.⁴⁰ Indeed, the physical collocation may highlight allusive subtleties inherent in the epigrams, or may have intriguing effects of its own. Such is the case, for example, with a pair of poems by Apollonides (AP 9.257) and Antiphanes (AP 9.258) on a spring that ran dry after being polluted by murder:⁴¹

ἢ Καθαρή—Νύμφαι γὰρ ἐπώνυμον ἔξοχον ἄλλων
κρήνη πασάων δῶκαν ἐμοὶ λιβάδων—,
ληϊστής ὅτε μοι παρακλίντορας ἔκτανεν ἄνδρας
καὶ φονίην ἱεροῖς ὕδασι λούσε χέρα,
κεῖνον ἀναστρέψασα γλυκὺν ῥόον οὐκέθ' ὀδίταις
βλύζω· τίς γὰρ ἔρει τὴν Καθαρὴν ἔτ' ἐμέ;
(Apollonid. AP 9.257 = *GPh* 17)

I, 'the Pure' (for the Nymphs conferred this name
on me, a spring, above all other fountains),
when a robber had killed men reclining by my side
and had washed his murderous hand in my sacred waters,
I reversed that sweet stream and no longer
gush forth for travellers. For who will still call me 'the Pure'?

ἢ πάρος εὐύδροισι λιβαζομένη προχοαῖσι
πτωχῇ νῦν Νυμφῶν μέχρι καὶ εἰς σταγόνα·
λυθράδεις γὰρ ἐμοῖσιν ἐνίψατο νάμασι χεῖρας
ἀνδροφόνος κηλὶδ' ὕδασιν ἐγκεράσας·
ἐξ οὗ μοι κοῦραι φύγον ἥλιον· εἰς ἓνα Βάκχον
εἰποῦσαι 'Νύμφαι μισγόμεθ', οὐκ ἐς Ἄρη·
(Antiphan. AP 9.258 = *GPh* 5)

I, who once trickled from wellsprings abundant in water,
am now devoid of liquid, to the very last drop.
For a murderer rinsed his gory hands in my floods,
mixing my water with contamination.
Ever since then my girls have fled the sun's light, saying:
'We Nymphs mingle with Bacchus alone, not with Ares.'

³⁹ Even though Bianor's and Antiphrilos' epigrams now stand in different parts of AP 9, it is a fair guess that they were originally juxtaposed. Other such pairs are Antip. Thess. AP 7.531 = *GPh* 23 (αὐτὰ) and Eryc. AP 7.230 = *GPh* 12 (ἀνίκ') on a Spartan mother killing her son, or Antip. Thess. AP 5.3 = *GPh* 7 (ὄρθρος) and Marc. Arg. AP 9.286 = *GPh* 16 (ὄρνι) cursing a rooster; consider, too, the self-variations by Antiphrilos on a farmer plowing over a tomb (AP 7.175 = *GPh* 24 and AP 7.176 = *GPh* 25: οὐτω/οὐχ) or Euenus on Praxiteles' Aphrodite (API 165 = *GPh* 10 and API 166 = *GPh* 11: Παλλάς/πρόσθε). For further examples, see Hirsch (1966), 410.

⁴⁰ Cf. Gutzwiller (1998), 227 on variation as 'a phenomenon by which the epigrams themselves, through overt intertextuality, reveal or incorporate the literary context in which they are to be read, a context that was perhaps originally meant to be physically absent but in the case of anthologies became physically present'.

⁴¹ Unless otherwise indicated, I follow the text of Gow and Page (1968). All translations are my own.

While Apollonides starts with the name of the personified spring, *Καθαρή* (vv. 1–2), and then recounts the events (vv. 3–4) leading up to its disappearance (vv. 5–6), Antiphanes begins with the spring's present state, which logically follows from the previous description.⁴² As we learn from the first poem, the spring has reversed its stream; consequently, it is now, in Antiphanes, 'devoid of liquid, to the very last drop' (v. 2). The spring poignantly asks at the end of Apollonides' epigram: 'Who will still call me *Καθαρή*?' (v. 6). It is therefore no coincidence that Antiphanes does not give its name but characterizes the spring as *ἡ πάρος εὐύδροισι λιβαζομένη προχοαῖσι* (v. 1). With the water's disappearance, it seems, the spring's name has been washed away as well, though we may perceive a faint echo of it in the poem's punchline, which transforms Apollonides' incipit, *ἡ Καθαρή*, into the acoustically similar *οὐκ ἐς Ἄρη*—that is, *οὐ καθαρή*, 'not pure'. On the surface, *ἡ πάρος* refers to the spring's former condition, but we may, I submit, also understand it metapoetically, as denoting the spring of the *previous* poem. By juxtaposing the epigrams, Philip adds further point to this meaning: within his anthology, Apollonides' spring precedes that of Antiphanes not just temporally, by virtue of being its archetype, but also physically, through the poems' spatial arrangement on the page.

A similar metapoetic game underlies an epigram pair on the suicide of a Roman soldier suffering from an incurable disease (AP 7.233 and 7.234).⁴³ While the original once again comes from Apollonides, the imitating text is a product of Philip's own muse. As mentioned above, Philip tends to start variations with the same letter as their models. In this case, the epigrams begin not just with the same letter but with the same word, namely *Aelius*:

*Αἴλιος, Αὐσονίης στρατιῆς πρόμος, ὁ χρυσέοισι
 στέμμασι σωρεύσας αὐχένas ὀπλοφόρους,
 νοῦσον ὅτ' εἰς ὑπάτην ὠλίσθανε τέρμα τ' ἄφυκτον
 εἶδεν, ἀριστεῖν ἐμφανίσας ἰδίην⁴⁴
 πῆξε δ' ὑπὸ σπλάγχνοισιν ἐὼν ξίφος, εἰπέ τε θνήσκων·
 'αὐτὸς ἐκὼν ἐδάμην, μὴ νόσος εὖχος ἔχη.'*
 (Apollonid. AP 7.233 = GPh 20)

5

Aelius, the commander of the Ausonian army, who piled up golden
 torques around his weapon-bearing neck,
 when he had fallen ill with his last disease and saw the end
 to be inevitable, in a demonstration of his innate virtue
 drove his own sword into his guts and, dying, spoke:
 'I have killed myself of my own free will, lest the illness boast of it.'

⁴² As Maria Kanellou has pointed out to me, the parallel between the two epigrams is highlighted by their identical structure, the first couplet introducing the spring, the second one narrating the murderous incident, and the third one recounting the spring's disappearance.

⁴³ Herrmann's (1951) attempt to identify the protagonist with a soldier of the second century BCE, let alone his suggestion that the last lines of the two epigrams translate one line each of a Latin epitaph, is utterly implausible.

⁴⁴ For the textual difficulties of vv. 3–4, see Pelliccio (2013), 217–19, whom I follow in adopting Beckby's reading.

Αἴλιος, ὁ θρασύχειρ Ἄρεος πρόμος, ὁ ψελιώσας
 αὐχένα χρυσοδέτοις ἐκ πολέμου στεφάνοις,
 τηξίμελει νούσῳ κεκολουμένος ἔδραμε θυμῷ
 ἐς προτέρην ἔργων ἄρσενα μαρτυρίην,
 ὦσε δ' ὑπὸ σπλάγχνοις πλατὺ φάσγανον ἐν μόνον εἰπών·
 'ἄνδρας ἄρης κτείνει, δειλοτέρους δὲ νόσος'.

5

(Phil. AP 7.234 = GPh 31)

Aelius, the bold-handed commander of War, who twined
 golden chains, won in combat, around his neck,
 when his life was cut short by a limb-wasting disease, ran back in his mind
 to the former testimony of his manly acts,
 and pushed the broad blade into his guts, saying only this:
 'War kills men, a disease cowards.'

Philip retains Apollonides' tripartite structure (introduction of the protagonist, vv. 1–2; terminal disease versus past courage, vv. 3–4; suicide and last words, vv. 5–6) while substituting many of his expressions with synonyms.⁴⁵ Most intriguingly, he has Aelius 'run back in his mind to the former testimony [προτέρην μαρτυρίην] of his manly acts'. Aelius' recollection of his past bravery serves, I suggest, as a metapoetic cue, pointing as it does to the soldier's previous demonstration of courage through suicide in Apollonides. Once again, the intertextual connection is highlighted through the poems' physical proximity.

Let us move on to the second type of concatenation (Category 2): the interweaving of poems through thematic, structural, or verbal links. A fascinating example is provided by AP 9.222 and 9.223, which at first sight do not seem to have much in common. The first one, a poem by Antiphilus (GPh 37) starting with *ἀνέρα*, is an epitaph for a dolphin, which died on land after carrying a dead man ashore; Bianor's epigram (GPh 7), starting with *ἀγγελίην*, tells of how a Cretan shot an eagle, which subsequently fell from the sky and killed him with his own arrow. Although seemingly unrelated, the poems appear like mirror images of each other if read together, as one is concerned with a dead human who caused an animal's death, while the other is about a dead animal who killed a human. It is unlikely that either author had the other's text in mind, but Philip invites us to perceive a thematic connection (note, too, how one epigram evokes a transition from sea to land, while the other records a transition from sky to earth).⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Note in particular his rewriting of the description of the torque, which rearranges Apollonides' word order and replaces the participle *σωρεύσας* with *ψελιώσας*, *ὀπλοφόρους* with *ἐκ πολέμου*, and *χρυσόισι στέμμασι* with *χρυσοδέτοις στεφάνοις* (a remarkable verbal transformation, considering the inclusion of these poems in an anthology named *Stephanos*).

⁴⁶ On AP 9.222 against the backdrop of interchanges between water and land in sepulchral epigram, see Tueller's chapter in this volume.

Significantly, the two poems are part of a series in which animals feature prominently (see Table 4.1):⁴⁷

Table 4.1 Animal series in AP 9.217–27

AP 9.217 = <i>GPh</i> 1	Mucius Scaevola	αἶ	Goats
[AP 9.218 = <i>GPh</i> 2	Aemilianus of Nicaea	ἀβάλε	Ship bearing corpses]
AP 9.219 = <i>GPh</i> 1	Diodorus of Sardes	αἰγιόβोटου	Tiberius' return to Rome
[AP 9.220 = <i>GPh</i> 5	Thallus of Miletus	ἄ	Plane tree]
AP 9.221 = <i>GPh</i> 35	Marcus Argentarius	αὔγάζω	Eros driving a lion chariot
AP 9.222 = <i>GPh</i> 37	Antiphilus of Byzantium	ἀνέρα	Epitaph of a dolphin
AP 9.223 = <i>GPh</i> 7	Bianor	ἀγγελίην	Shot eagle 'shoots' man
AP 9.224 = <i>GPh</i> 23	Crinagoras	αἶγα	Augustus' goat
AP 9.225 = <i>GPh</i> 4	Honestus	Ἀσωπίς	Asopis and Pegasus
AP 9.226 = <i>GPh</i> 6	Diodorus Zonas	αἶ	Bees
AP 9.227 = <i>GPh</i> 8	Bianor	ἄκταίνην	Fisherman catching octopus
AP 9.14 = <i>GPh</i> 30	Antiphilus	αἰγιαλοῦ	Fisherman catching octopus

AP 9.217, which addresses two goats, is verbally linked with AP 9.219, a celebration of Tiberius' return to Rome⁴⁸ with the incipit αἰγιόβोटου ('goat feeding'); AP 9.221, on a gem incised with the image of Eros steering a lion chariot, precedes our pair of poems on the dolphin and the eagle, which in turn are followed by AP 9.224, a poem about a goat accompanying Augustus on his sea voyages. This epigram intriguingly unites the two themes of AP 9.217 and 9.219, goats and imperial exploits. Comparing the emperor to Zeus, Crinagoras has Augustus' goat envision its own catasterism, on the model of the latter's wetnurse Amaltheia, with an etymological pun on the god's epithet αἰγίοχος ('aegis bearing', vv. 5–6).⁴⁹ Through its evocation of Zeus, the epigram is connected with the preceding text (AP 9.223), which presents an eagle as the god's messenger (ἀγγελίην Ζηνός, v. 1). The eagle's fall from sky to earth is, moreover, reversed in the goat's wished-for catasterism. The next poem, AP 9.225, recalls how the spring Pegasus (= Hippocrene) was created by a horse's hooves, while AP 9.226 is an address to bees. Last but not least, Bianor's poem on the octopus (AP 9.227), which was presumably juxtaposed with Antiphilus' epigram on the same topic (AP 9.14), picks up the three elements that link our epigram pair: the octopus is caught in the *sea*, hurled into the *air*, and falls on a rabbit sleeping on *land*

⁴⁷ Even if this sequence contained further poems, now lost or moved to other books, there is still a clearly visible pattern. For a discussion of two other thematic series in the epsilon and eta sections of the *Garland*, see Höschle (2016), 113–15.

⁴⁸ On the identification of the protagonist Nero with Tiberius, see Gow and Page (1968), 2: 265.

⁴⁹ Note how the poem's last word, Αἰγίοχου, picks up its incipit, αἶγα. As Ypsilanti (2018), 250–1 shows, some ancient writers in fact connected the aegis with the goat Amaltheia, an explanation rejected by others.

(just as the eagle of AP 9.223 had dropped on the Cretan hunter). What is more, this double catch, consisting of prey from both sea and land,⁵⁰ recalls the dichotomy between land and sea creatures that stands at the centre of the dolphin's epitaph (AP 9.222).⁵¹

There can be no doubt that the poems in this series interact in a variety of ways. To make things even more complex, Bianor's poem (AP 9.223) is varied by Apollonides, in an epigram that starts with a different letter (ἰοτυπής, AP 9.265 = *GPh* 19)⁵² and hence belongs to a later section of the *Garland*, where the eagle's plunge from the sky is paralleled by several similar falls.⁵³ Philip in fact created numerous links across sections by positioning variations in separate parts of the *Garland* or by distributing poems on the same theme across the collection (Category 4). Thus we encounter, for instance, epigrams on Myron's cow 'grazing' among alpha, beta, eta, and chi texts,⁵⁴ while the Cynic Diogenes can be seen 'wandering' through the first part of the collection, making his appearance in the alpha, beta, gamma, delta, and eta sections.⁵⁵

In this chapter I cannot delve more deeply into these macrotextual connections, which constitute an integral element of Philip's technique. A further structural device that deserves closer examination is the accumulation of poems on certain key themes within individual letter groups (Category 5). As I have argued elsewhere, the alpha section seems to have contained a striking number of epitaphs on poets,⁵⁶ which in all likelihood served to mark the collection's beginning by paying homage to literary greats of the past, as did the long sequence of poets' epitaphs that opened Meleager's funerary book.⁵⁷ In addition, we encounter a conglomeration of alpha poems on wine, song, the

⁵⁰ Cf. ὑπ' ἄγρης | ἐμβυθίης ἄγρη χερσόθεν ('through the catch from the depth of the sea [came] a catch from the land', AP 9.227.7–8) and γέρας ἀμφοτέρωθεν | ἄγρης χερσαίης . . . καὶ εἰναλίης ('a gift from both elements, one catch from the land . . . and one from the sea', AP 9.14.7–8).

⁵¹ Cf. χερσαῖον ὁ πόντιος ('the sea-dweller the land creature', v. 1); ἡ μὲν ἐκείνου | χθὼν ἐμέ, τὸν δ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἔκτανε τοῦμόν ὕδωρ ('his land killed me, and my water him who came from the land', vv. 5–6).

⁵² The epigram is also ascribed to Philip, but Pelliccio (2013), 31 and 205 convincingly argues for Apollonides' authorship.

⁵³ AP 9.267 = *GPh* 30 (Ἰκαρίην) by Philip, separated from Apollonides' epigram by one poem, compares a man's fall into the Icarian sea with the fate of Icarus; it was probably coupled with its model, i.e. anon. AP 7.699 = *GPh* 2 (Ἰκάρου). Similarly, Bianor AP 7.388 = *GPh* 3 (ἰχθύσι) describes how a would-be tyrannicide was hurled off a cliff.

⁵⁴ Euenus AP 9.718 = *GPh* 9 (αὐτός); Phil. AP 9.742 = *GPh* 79 (ἄπαιρε); Marc. Arg. AP 9.732 = *GPh* 36 (βουκόλον); Euenus AP 9.717 = *GPh* 8 (ῆ); Tull. Gem. AP 9.740 = *GPh* 5 (ῆ); and probably anon. or Tull. Gem. AP 9.741 (χάλακος).

⁵⁵ Arch. AP 7.68 = *GPh* 14 (Ἄιδος); Antip. Thess. AP 11.158 = *GPh* 97 (αἰάζει); Honest. AP 7.66 = *GPh* 2 (βάκτρον); Antiphil. API 334 = *GPh* 46 (γηράσκει); Antip. Thess. AP 7.65 = *GPh* 77 (Διογένης); Antiphil. API 333 = *GPh* 45 (ῆ). I should note that it is unclear whether any epigrams ascribed to Archias were included in the *Garland*; cf. Gow and Page (1968), 2: 432–5.

⁵⁶ See Höschele (2018).

⁵⁷ On the structure of this book, whose first section was devoted to famous persons and contained at least sixty epitaphs on poets, see Gutzwiller (1998), 307–15 with Table V.

Muses, bees, and cicadas⁵⁸ which probably had a programmatic function comparable to that of the epigrams on wine, song, garlands, and *charis* at the beginning of Meleager's *erotica*.⁵⁹ Last but not least, Philip created a distinct sense of an ending in the *Garland*'s final sequence by interweaving a series of apotropaic epigrams, including a self-composed epitaph on Hipponax that chases the reader away (AP 7.405 = *GPh* 34), as well as two epigrams on drinking, which may have served as a sort of *sphragis* to his collection.⁶⁰

As my final example, I would like to present a pair of texts that are linked by what I consider to be the most sophisticated type of concatenation (Category 3), one that is not immediately visible but requires an intertextually alert reader to perceive. What I have in mind is a possible connection between Diodorus, AP 7.627 = *GPh* 6, an epigram starting with ἡμιτελή on a young man who died shortly before marriage, and AP 7.385, a poem by Philip (*GPh* 33) starting with ἥρως on the tomb of Protesilaus, whose trees shed their leaves as soon as they grow high enough to view Troy. Philip's text is a variation of an epigram by Antiphilus (AP 7.141 = *GPh* 23) with the incipit Θέσσαλέ. As Cameron and Hirsch observed, it is very likely that this pair of epigrams created a bridge from one section to the next:⁶¹ located within one of the main alphabetical sequences (AP 7.364 to 7.405), AP 7.385 is followed by a single eta poem (Bassus AP 7.386 = *GPh* 4 on Niobe), and it is a fair guess that Antiphilus' Protesilaus epigram, which now appears out of sequence, once opened the subsequent theta section or stood towards its beginning. Protesilaus, whose leap from a Greek ship to the shore signalled the beginning of the Trojan War, might have seemed a particularly appropriate choice for this kind of textual boundary crossing.⁶²

Diodorus' epitaph on Hipparchus forms part of the second alphabetical sequence in Book 7 (AP 7.622 to 7.645), where it precedes four additional eta

⁵⁸ Cicadas: Marc. Arg. AP 7.364 = *GPh* 21, Euenus AP 9.122 = *GPh* 5; singing birds: Arch. AP 7.191 = *GPh* 20, whose inclusion in the *Garland* is uncertain, and AP 9.343 = *GPh* 24; poetic locations: Honest. AP 9.225 = *GPh* 4 and AP 9.230 = *GPh* 5; Muses: Parmen. AP 9.43 = *GPh* 6, Crin. AP 9.234 = *GPh* 48; bees: Diod. Zon. AP 9.226 = *GPh* 6, Antiphil. AP 9.404 = *GPh* 42; wine and drinking: Marc. Arg. AP 9.229 = *GPh* 24, Antip. Thess. AP 9.231 = *GPh* 35, Phil. AP 9.232 = *GPh* 42, Quintus Maec. AP 9.403 = *GPh* 10, Antig. AP 9.406 = *GPh* 1, Honest. AP 11.45 = *GPh* 9, Antimedon AP 11.46 = *GPh* 1.

⁵⁹ See Gutzwiller (1997; 1998, 284–6).

⁶⁰ In Höschle (2017), 21–8 I show how Antip. Thess. AP 11.24 = *GPh* 3, an epigram on a Greek boy named Helicon who serves Italian wine, becomes an emblem of the *Garland* itself, the work of a Greek who presents us with epigrams of predominantly Roman content. What is more, the evocation of Hippocrene in this epigram, together with the image of wine as a horse in Antip. Thess. AP 11.23 = *GPh* 38, may contain a hidden pun on Philip's name (the 'horse lover')—a layer of meaning not foreseen by the author but given to the poems through their inclusion in the *Garland*.

⁶¹ Cf. Hirsch (1966), 402 and A. Cameron (1993), 42.

⁶² As Hirsch (1966), 413 notes, Antip. Thess. AP 7.136 = *GPh* 55 (on the tomb of Priam), which has the same incipit as Philip's Protesilaus epigram (AP 7.385: ἥρως), may have stood nearby.

epigrams. While it is impossible to tell where exactly the poem stood in relation to Philip's Protesilaus epigram, I would like to suggest that Philip invited his readers to perceive a link between the two poems. Both Hipparchus and Protesilaus die young, leaving behind a grieving bride. The parallel between their fate alone would not suffice to posit a deliberate connection, but the incipit of Diodorus' epigram, ἡμιτελῇ θάλαμον, firmly establishes Hipparchus as a second Protesilaus by alluding to the famous Homeric expression δόμος ἡμιτελής, designating the house that Protesilaus is said to have left behind, together with a wife tearing both her cheeks (ἀμφιδρυφής) at *Iliad* 2.700–1.⁶³ The precise meaning of ἡμιτελής, a Homeric *hapax*, was disputed already in antiquity; one explanation saw it as a reference to Protesilaus' childlessness, according to others it denoted the bereft state of his household, the incomplete building of his *thalamos*, or the fact that the marriage had not been properly completed.⁶⁴ That the idea of a 'half-complete house' is inextricably linked with the myth of Protesilaus is, moreover, confirmed by evocations of the Homeric line both in Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead*—where Protesilaus explains that he died because of Helen, ἡμιτελῇ μὲν τὸν δόμον καταλιπὼν, χήραν τε νεόγαμον γυναῖκα ('leaving behind a half-completed house and a newlywed woman turned widow', *DMort.* 27.1)—and in Philostratus' *Heroicus*—where Protesilaus' ghost praises the verses Homer composed about him, not least the description of his wife as ἀμφιδρυφής and his home as ἡμιτελής (*Her.* 12).⁶⁵ An ancient reader encountering Diodorus' epigram for the first time would thus surely think of Protesilaus upon reading its initial distich:

ἡμιτελῇ θάλαμόν τε καὶ ἐγγύθι νυμφικὰ λέκτρα,
κοῦρε, λιπὼν ὁλοὴν οἶμον ἔβης Αἴδου
(Diod. AP 7.627.1–2 = *GPh* 6.1–2)

Leaving behind the half-built chamber and the bridal bed close at hand,
lad, you went down the deadly path to Hades.

I believe it very likely that Philip picked up on this allusion and inscribed himself in the intertextual game by positioning his own epigram on Protesilaus somewhere in the proximity of Diodorus' poem.

⁶³ τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀμφιδρυφῆς ἄλοχος Φυλάκῃ ἐλέλειπτο | καὶ δόμος ἡμιτελής ('and his wife, her cheeks torn, was left behind in Phylace, as well as his house, half-completed').

⁶⁴ Cf. the Homeric scholia and Eustathius' commentary ad loc. See also the Attic glossary *Philetaerus*, s.v. τέλειος ('childless') and Strabo 7.3.3 ('bereft').

⁶⁵ Cf. Grossardt (2006), 2: 419, who also notes Diodorus' allusion to the Homeric passage. In an inscriptional poem on the death of his wife Regilla (*SEG* 23.121), Herodes Atticus gives expression to his sense of bereavement by echoing the Homeric phrase (ζῶω δ' ἀχ[ν]ύμενος, τό μοι οἰκία ταῦτα τέτυκται | νόσφι φίλης ἀλόχου καὶ δόμος ἡμιτελής, 'but I live in mourning, since my dwelling is built without my beloved wife and my house only half-complete'); see also Gleason (2010), 140–2.

To be sure, my argument must, to a certain degree, remain speculative, but we have good reason for assuming that Philip created such a connection. It would surely be in line with his editorial practice, which was much more sophisticated than most critics have realized. I hope to have offered a first impression of Philip's arrangement and of the challenges we face in examining his ensemble. While it is impossible to reconstruct the *Garland* fully, we can still determine clear traces of patterning and, with reasonable caution, ponder links not visible at first sight. Did Philip succeed in weaving a *Garland* that can rival Meleager's? I would certainly say so.

Epigrams on Authors and Books as Text and Paratext

Kristoffel Demoen

Canonical authors and their works have always been a popular subject in the epigrammatic tradition, featuring a wide range of literary forms and pragmatic functions (section 1). These epigrams are especially known through literary transmission, notably in the *Greek Anthology*, but they are also often used as prologues or epilogues in the manuscripts of the works they comment upon, in which case they are found in situ as book epigrams (section 2). The twofold transmission of epigrams on authors and books is thus another instance of the well-known distinction between literary and inscribed epigrams (section 3). The latter are instances of what Gérard Genette has called paratexts (section 4). The tenth-century manuscript of the *Palatine Anthology* appears to include not only epigrams as part of the literary anthology itself, but also paratextual epigrams that have not always been correctly recognized, or have not received the attention they deserve (section 5.1). Moreover, for several epigrams, their place in this literary anthology is but one of their locations and functions (section 5.2).

1. LITERARY EPIGRAMS ON AUTHORS AND THEIR WORK

ἐννέα τὰς Μούσας φασὶν τινες· ὥς ὀλιγώρως·
ἦ νῖδε καὶ Σαπφὼ Λεσβόθεν ἡ δεκάτῃ.
(‘Pl.’ AP 9.506 = FGE 13)

Some say the Muses are nine: how careless!
Look, there’s Sappho too, from Lesbos, the tenth.¹

¹ On the topos of Sappho as the tenth Muse, see Gosetti-Murrayjohn (2006). The translations of epigrams from the *Greek Anthology* are based on those in Paton’s (1916–18) Loeb, revised by

Ancient poets, historians, philosophers, rhetors, and so on, especially the canonical ones, have been a favourite subject for poets throughout the history of Greek literature. The *Greek Anthology*, for instance, offers hundreds of examples of epigrams on authors and books, clearly considering them to be an acknowledged subgenre of the epigrammatic tradition. Such pieces appear especially among the funerary and epideictic epigrams (Books 7 and 9a).² Within this large corpus of verses on authors, one may distinguish several types, according to content, literary form, function, and textual transmission.

On the matter of content, some of the epigrams deal with the author as a person, without reference to particular works. This may be general praise, as in the Sappho distich, or, less frequently, blame.³ Other epigrams are more specific and include references to or anecdotes about the author's life. One example is the epigram on Xenophon by the biographer and poetaster Diogenes Laertius (D.L. 2.58 = AP 7.97), with the incipit οὐ μόνον ἐς Πέρσας ἀνέβη Ξενοφῶν διὰ Κῦρον ('Xenophon not only marched up country to the Persians for Cyrus' sake'). Diogenes Laertius obviously felt that the inclusion of epigrams, both self-written and collected, was his task as a biographer: they are omnipresent in his work. His *Life of Plato*, for instance, presents a series of five sepulchral epigrams as the conclusion of the biography proper. This is followed by a telling transition to the discussion of Plato's pupils, as if Diogenes is going from one essential biographical topic to another: καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπιγράμματα ταῦτα. μαθηταὶ δ' αὐτοῦ . . . ('These, then, were the epigrams. Now his pupils . . .').⁴

Epitaphs on classical authors are indeed very common. Homer was, of course, a popular subject, and discussions about his native city and his burial place have become stock themes in epigram. The paradox of the tomb of this great poet being located on the small island of Ios, which goes back to a Hellenistic example by Antipater of Sidon (AP 7.2 = HE 8), is varied upon by the early Byzantine poet Paul the Silentiary:

Tueller for Books 1–5. Unless stated otherwise, the Greek text is Beckby's (1957–8). All other translations are my own.

² The *Greek Anthology* contains about 370 epigrams on some ninety different (groups of) ancient and late antique authors (not including philosophers unless they are celebrated as writers); seventy-six are (allegedly) book inscriptions, especially transmitted in Book 9a of AP. The label 'epideictic' is not unproblematic; see Lauxtermann (1998).

³ Clayman (2007), 500–3 discusses *ad hominem* attacks in Hellenistic epigrams on philosophers; on the topic of praise and blame in epigrams on philosophers, see Romero's chapter in this volume. In what follows I discuss an example of epigrammatic criticism of a poet (namely Lycophron).

⁴ D.L. 3.45–6. The five sepulchral epigrams also survive as AP 7.60–2 (those presented as real epitaphs) and AP 7.108–9 (Diogenes Laertius' own compositions).

ἐνθάδε Πιερίδων τὸ σοφὸν στόμα, θεῖον Ὅμηρον,
 κλεινὸς ἐπ' ἀγχιάλῳ τύμβος ἔχει σκοπέλῳ.
 εἰ δ' ὀλίγη γεγαυῖα τόσον χάδεν ἀνέρα νῆσος,
 μὴ τόδε θαμβήσης, ὦ ξένε, δερκόμενος· (. . .)
 (Paul. Sil. AP 7.4.1–4)

Here the skilled mouth of the Pierian Muses, divine Homer,
 has found a famous tomb on the rock by the sea.
 That so little an island can contain so great a man
 should not surprise you, O stranger, as you look.

A second group of epigrams focuses on an author's particular work. This is the case in a notoriously difficult poem by Callimachus on Aratus' *Phaenomena*:

Ἡσιόδου τό τ' αἶσμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν αἰοιδῶν
 ἔσχατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον
 τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο. χαίρετε, λεπταὶ
 ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης.
 (Call. AP 9.507 = HE 56)

The rhythm and the manner are Hesiod's. Not the worst
 of poets, but, I am afraid, the most honeyed
 of his verses was taken as a model by the man of Soli. Hail! Delicate
 phrases, the monument of Aratus' sleepless nights.

The interpretation, especially of the first distich, is disputed.⁵ Whatever the exact meaning, it is clear that the intention is laudatory: Callimachus praises the delicate didactic poem of his contemporary colleague.⁶

The next epigram, by contrast, was written several centuries after its subject, and this time it is not literary quality that is at stake, but authorship. Elias of Alexandria, the sixth-century Neoplatonist commentator of Aristotle, informs us that the fifth-century philosopher Syrianus wrote the following verses on Plato's *Phaedo*, in response to Panaetius of Rhodes, who had declared the dialogue spurious, probably because it conflicted with his own belief in the mortality of the soul.⁷ The epigram, also preserved—anonously—in the *Palatine Anthology*, clearly sides with Plato:

⁵ See full discussion in Gärtner (2007), with references to earlier interpretations. Gärtner proposes to read μὴ οὐ in v. 2. Callimachus would then imply that Aratus has imitated a good poet (namely Hesiod), yet *not* the sweetest of his works (i.e. his *Works and Days*). As a result, Aratus' delicate phrases deserve all the more praise. Gärtner also defends (rightly, I think) the manuscript reading σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη ('intense nightly activity') in the last verse.

⁶ Another contemporary, Leonidas of Tarentum, wrote a similar epigram on the *Phaenomena* (AP 9.25 = HE 101), in which the same quality is praised: λεπτῇ φροντίδι ('with delicate care', vv. 1–2). Leonidas and Callimachus may have been aware of the λεπτή acrostic in Aratus (vv. 783–7), on which see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 229.

⁷ Elias of Alexandria, *In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium*, p. 133 Busse. Elias quotes the epigram in full. For a discussion of the epigram and of what Panaetius might have meant by calling the *Phaedo* νόθος ('bastard, spurious'), see Joyal (2014), 83–5. Joyal questions Syrianus' authorship of the epigram, but his arguments are not conclusive.

εἴ με Πλάτων οὐ γράψαι, δύω ἐγένοντο Πλάτωνες·
 Σωκρατικῶν δάρων ἄνθεα πάντα φέρω.
 ἀλλὰ νόθον μ' ἐτέλεσσε Παναίτιος, ὅς ῥ' ἐτάλασσε⁸
 καὶ ψυχὴν θνητὴν καί με νόθον τελέσαι.
 (Syrian. AP 9.358)

If Plato did not write me there were two Platos,
 for I have all the flowers of the Socratic dialogues.
 But Panaetius made me out to be spurious; he who dared
 to make both the soul mortal and me spurious.

A final example of an epigram on a literary work is this clumsy poem by the Byzantine schoolmaster Cometis (c.900 CE), a piece transmitted only in the *Greek Anthology*:

σεῖο βίβλους μεγάθυμε Κομητὰς Ὅμηρε δύ' ἄρδην
 εὐρὼν γηραλέας τεύξατο ὀπλοτέρας·
 γῆρας ἀποξύσας γὰρ ἀριπρεπέας γε βροτοῖσι
 πᾶμπαν ἔδειξε σοφοῖς, οἷσιν ἔνεστι νόος.
 (Cometis AP 15.37)

Great-souled Homer, Cometis having found your two books
 utterly aged, made them younger;
 for, having scraped off their old age, he exhibited them in new brilliancy
 to those of the learned who have understanding.

Cometis addresses Homer directly and boasts that he has restored (i.e. probably transliterated, punctuated, and accentuated) the epics.⁹ This epigram, then, is not so much about the author or his oeuvre as it is about a particular edition of the Homeric poems: it is related to the materialization of the text in the manuscript.

In the examples of epigrams on authors presented so far, the literary form corresponds to the—real or alleged—inscriptional function of the epigram. Deictic elements evoke an inscription, for instance on the base of a statue (ἡνίδε in 'Pl.' AP 9.506 on Sappho) or on a gravestone (in Paul. Sil. AP 7.4, the epitaph on Homer: ἐνθάδε and the traditional generic motif of the passer-by being addressed by the tomb). Yet, at least in the case of the epitaphs on Xenophon and Homer (D.L. AP 7.97 and Paul. Sil. AP 7.4), it is obvious that they are mere literary play, only pretending to be inscriptions.

The case of the epigrams on authors' works is more complicated. Again, we recognize the stylistic devices known from epitaphs and dedications: a book (the *Phaenomena*) or an author (Homer) is addressed (χαίρετε in Call. AP 9.507.3), or the book itself speaks in the first person (the *Phaedo* in Syrian.

⁸ The Palatine manuscript reads ἐτέλεσσε, thus repeating the preceding verb in the same verse; I here retain the reading from Busse's edition of Elias; Planudes also has ἐτάλασσε.

⁹ Aubreton (1969); but see Pontani (1982); A. Cameron (1993), 309–10.

AP 9.358).¹⁰ These references to the literary work as actually being present suggest that the poems were once really ‘inscribed’ in copies of the texts that form their subject or evoke, playfully, such a scenario of use. They might have served as an editorial preface (Cometas AP 15.37), a note on the authenticity of the text (Syrian. AP 9.358), or a blurb (Call. AP 9.507).

2. EPIGRAMS IN AND ON MANUSCRIPTS: BOOK EPIGRAMS

Many Greek manuscripts, indeed, include metrical prefaces or epilogues comparable to the epigrams by Callimachus, Syrianus, or Cometas. As a matter of fact, at least three later manuscripts of Plato (from the twelfth to the fifteenth century CE) have Syrianus’ poem on the *Phaedo* as a marginal text, explicitly labelled as an ἐπίγραμμα εἰς τὸν Φαίδωνα.¹¹ In these cases, one may say that the epigrams occupy their ‘real’ place and that they are found in situ. They mostly precede or follow the main text(s) transmitted in the manuscript, so they are written on the thresholds of books, where they perform their original *epigraphic* (or *epigrammatic*)¹² function. This function does not differ that much from that of inscriptions on other objects such as graves, statues, or votive offerings: they clarify, motivate, and present the object *on* which they are inscribed.

‘Inscriptional’ epigrams of this kind have been labelled ‘book epigrams’,¹³ in a sense analogous to that of ‘grave epigrams’: the poems comment on (sometimes lending a voice to) the very object that displays them or its contents. Not all book epigrams have authors or texts as their (main) subject: many are dedications to a patron, to saints, or to God or contain identifications of the owner of the manuscript, instructions to the reader, captions explaining the miniatures, metrical prayers or colophons by scribes. However, a good

¹⁰ On this phenomenon, see Männlein-Robert (2007b), 175–82.

¹¹ *Par. gr. 1808* (XII), *Laur. Plut. VI.22* (XV), and *Munich BSB gr. 514* (XV).

¹² Compare the dominant Byzantine meaning of the term *epigramma*, as attested in the etymological definition in the *Suda* at ε 2270: πάντα τὰ ἐπιγραφόμενά τισι, καὶ μὴ ἐν μέτροις εἰρημένα, ἐπιγράμματα λέγεται (‘whatever is inscribed on something, even if it is not in verse, is called an epigram’).

¹³ Lauxtermann (2003), 197 defined them as ‘poems that are intimately related to the production of literary texts and manuscripts’ in his chapter ‘Book Epigrams’ (197–212). Cf. Komines (1966), 38–45; Bianconi (2009); Bernard and Demoen (forthcoming). The term ‘book epigram’ has become standard in the fields of manuscript studies and Byzantine literature; see already A. Cameron (1993), 289 and 333. There might be some confusion, since it is sporadically used for the ‘bookish’, purely literary epigrams (e.g. Schmitz 2010a), like the German *Buchepigramm* in Meyer (2005) and Höschele (2010), 86–99, for example.

deal of them do closely correspond to the literary types known from the *Greek Anthology*: they praise the author or his work (or both).

Several thousands of Greek manuscripts contain such epigrams.¹⁴ Although most were inserted at the time of the production of the manuscript, some were added later, by its readers or owners. The affinity of book epigrams with inscriptions is often reinforced by their visual presentation: they tend to be written in a different colour, notably red ink, and in a distinct handwriting, notably the so-called *Auszeichnungsmajuskel*, a 'distinctive uncial' that imitates the script of inscriptions on stone.¹⁵ They are also frequently distinguished from the main text through non-textual signs or an ornamental framing.¹⁶

3. EPIGRAMS ON AUTHORS AND BOOKS: 'INSCRIBED' AND 'LITERARY'

The difference between the epigrams from the *Greek Anthology* and book epigrams is comparable to the well-known distinction between literary and inscribed epigrams, most often discussed in relation to funerary and dedicatory epigrams.¹⁷ It has long been recognized that the influence is mutual:¹⁸ certainly from Hellenistic times onwards, poets mimic epigraphic models; conversely, many inscriptions have literary qualities,¹⁹ being sometimes inspired by literary texts or plainly quoting them; collections of epigrams often include both kinds, inscriptions arguably becoming literary once they are copied into a manuscript and hence decontextualized; and, finally, anthologies can be used as copy books, which possibly leads to the recontextualization of epigrams. There is, then, no impermeable distinction between 'inscribed' and 'literary': the same poems can be, and often are, transmitted in both ways. Their nature and function change with the mode of transmission. When they are preserved in situ (i.e. on stone for epitaphs and dedications, in the liminal sections of manuscripts for book epigrams), they are inscribed; when they are known to us from their inclusion in poetic collections, they are literary.

¹⁴ They are collected and made freely available in an ongoing database project based at Ghent University (www.dbbe.ugent.be). Full text, bibliography, and contextual information of all book epigrams mentioned in this article are to be found there, often along with a link to digitized images of the manuscript.

¹⁵ The term was introduced by Hunger (1977). See also Stefec (2011).

¹⁶ For a typology of visual representations of book epigrams, see Meesters (forthcoming).

¹⁷ The scholarly literature is abundant; see e.g. Rosen (2007), 459–60; Bing (2009); and some chapters in this book such as those of Barbantani, Day (who discusses 'quasi-inscriptional' epigrams), and Hunter.

¹⁸ See e.g. Bettenworth (2007).

¹⁹ On the topic, see Hunter's chapter in this volume.

The literary transmission of book epigrams takes several forms.²⁰ The best known is, as we have already seen, within anthologies of epigrams, from the early *Garlands* to the later Byzantine *Planudean Anthology* (c.1300).²¹ One also finds them within the ‘collected poems’ of a particular author, as part of a literary oeuvre. For instance, John Geometres, who lived in the tenth century CE and was well acquainted with the epigrams from the *Greek Anthology*, wrote an epigram ‘on the philosophers’ (εἰς τοὺς φιλοσόφους), with puns on their names:

τρῆϊς σοφίης πολυίστορος ἔκκριτοι, ἀστέρες οἶοι,
ἐνθέμενοι βίβλοις ὄλβον ἀπειρέσιον·
Ἀρχύτας ἤρξε, Πλάτων πλάτυνε, τέλος δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσι,
ὥς ἔτυχε κληθείς, θῆκεν Ἀριστοτέλης.

(van Opstall 2008: Geometres poem 26)

Three chosen men—stars, as it were—of very learned wisdom
have deposited an immense wealth in (these?) books.
Archytas started, Plato made it grow, and the fulfilment of all
was reached, as he happened to be named, by Aristotle.

The poem may once have served as a metrical table of contents of a manuscript with philosophical texts, but we know it only from three manuscripts containing poetic works by John Geometres,²² so we cannot be sure whether it has been composed as a literary poem or as an actual book epigram. John’s oeuvre also includes epigrams with an unambiguous title concerning their original function as book epigrams, such as the three poems ‘on the book’ of Gregory of Nazianzus (εἰς τὴν βίβλον τοῦ Θεολόγου).²³ Yet, here again, the poems are not to be found in any manuscript with Gregory’s works.

Still other epigrams on authors or texts are transmitted indirectly, through attestations or quotations. Diogenes Laertius gives many epigrams, as we have seen. Plutarch (*Dem.* 30) is the first one to mention a distich that, as he says, was inscribed on the base of Demosthenes’ statue in Athens (incipit εἴπερ ἴσῃν γνώμῃ, ‘If equal to your mind’); the epigram is also known from other sources, such as Photius (*Bibl.* 265.494b), and reappears as a book epigram in two late manuscripts.²⁴ This short poem, then, has switched functions twice: beginning as an inscription, it became a quotation in a literary work, before finally

²⁰ Similarly, Schmitz (2010a), 386–8 lists possible ways in which inscriptional epigrams were available to Alexandrian scholars and poets in the form of written books.

²¹ See the subsections (κεφάλαια) εἰς ποιητάς and εἰς φιλοσόφους (‘On poets’ and ‘On philosophers’) in several Planudean books. Epigrams on poets had been popular since Hellenistic times, see Gabathuler (1937); L. Rossi (2001), 81–106.

²² Van Opstall (2008), 160–2.

²³ Poem 123 in van Opstall (2008) has a typical deictic opening: ἐνταῦθα σάλπιγξ, ἡ θεόκτυπος λύρα | βροντῆς λόγων πληροῦσα γῆν τε καὶ πόλον (‘Here is the trumpet, the lyre sounding from God, filling heaven and earth with its thundering words’).

²⁴ *Laur. Plut.* 59, *Cod.* 8 (XIV) and *Par. gr.* 1773 (1493).

appearing as an inscribed book epigram. The same Photius (*Bibl.* 128.96b) quotes ‘the book epigram’ (τὸ τῆς βιβλίου ἐπίγραμμα) that he found, apparently, in his copy of Lucian. It is ostensibly written by Lucian himself who speaks in the first person (Λουκιανὸς τὰδ’ ἔγραψα, ‘I, Lucian, wrote these’), but it is generally taken to be spurious.²⁵

All these types of transmission (anthologies, collected poems, quotations) have one crucial element in common: the epigrams are part of the main text copied in manuscripts. Even if they once really served as book epigrams, they lost this function in the process. When detached from their original context, they became texts instead of paratexts.

4. PARATEXTS: THEORY, HISTORY, AND TYPOLOGY

The term ‘paratext’ famously goes back to Gérard Genette and his seminal *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (1997).²⁶ Genette proposed a detailed terminology and typology, while insisting that his book was ‘only an introduction, and exhortation, to the study of the paratext’.²⁷ The essence of paratexts is that they are dependent on a main text, which they present to readers, shaping and influencing their expectations and reading by offering them an explanation, an interpretation, an advice, and so on. As liminal devices, paratexts are found on the ‘threshold’ between the inner world of the text and the outer world, between the book as ideal reality and as material object. Verses on authors and texts, when used as book epigrams, clearly meet Genette’s essential criteria. Paradoxically, Genette himself repeatedly states that his observations and categories pertain primarily or exclusively to the Gutenberg era, but his notions and types are much more applicable to Greek manuscripts than he himself is aware, despite the undeniable differences between manuscript and print publication. Genette’s exhortation has been successful, and western medieval scholars in particular have fruitfully applied his theory. However, the early history of the paratext has yet to be written. Although the origin, date, and authorship of most Greek paratexts are doubtful, it is clear that the genre ultimately goes back to the Hellenistic scholars and poets.²⁸

When categorizing paratexts, Genette introduces some basic distinctions along spatial, temporal, and pragmatic lines. The two dichotomies that are most important for my purpose are that of ‘original’ (i.e. included in the first

²⁵ Baldwin (1975), 311–12. Again, this poem pops up in a late manuscript of Lucian: *Ambros. A218 inf.* (XV).

²⁶ The original French title is *Seuils* (see Genette 1987).

²⁷ Genette (1997), 404.

²⁸ Bing (2008), 30: ‘epigrams concerning, and—allegedly—inscribed within, a book were new’ (in the Hellenistic period). For some examples, see *ibid.*, n. 28.

edition of a work) versus 'later' paratexts and that of 'authorial' (i.e. written by or ascribed to the author of the main text) versus 'allographic' (i.e. written by someone else) paratexts. Most of the topics and forms to which Genette devotes a chapter in his book are relevant to ancient and medieval book circulation, despite his own hesitation in this respect: material presentation (format, cover, typesetting, and, in the case of manuscripts, script, ink, etc.); the author's name; titles, (sub)headings, and tables of contents; dedications; epigraphs; prefaces. When we apply Genette's categories to text- and author-related verses in manuscripts, we come to the following typology:²⁹

(a) 'Traditional' paratexts, that is, transmitted along with the main text. It is not always clear whether or not they are 'original' in the sense of having been there right from the start of the circulation of the text. They may be 'authorial' or 'allographic'; and it is often difficult to ascertain whether 'authorial' paratexts, typically written in the first person, are authentic, fictive, or apocryphal.³⁰

One subgroup of 'traditional authorial' paratexts constitutes part of the main text itself, and therefore verges on the border between text and paratext. Paratexts of this cluster take many forms: prologues or preambles;³¹ dedicatory or programmatic verses (such as, most famously, fr. 1 of Callimachus' *Aetia*); the inclusion of the author's name as a *sphragis* ('seal');³² acrostics (an example is discussed in section 5.1); envois and postfaces. In single-authored poetry books, these liminal functions are typically fulfilled by the opening and final poems; well-known examples from Latin poetry are to be found in Catullus (whose poem 1 is programmatic and dedicatory at once), Horace (e.g. *Carm.* 1.1), and Martial (there are several instances in his books of epigrams). On the Greek side, Strato, for instance, must have followed the same model when preparing his edition, as we can deduce from the multi-authored twelfth book of the *Greek Anthology*: the anthologist has placed Strato's introductory and concluding epigrams at the beginning and end of AP 12.³³

²⁹ The tripartition is inspired by Wallraff and Andrist (2015), 239–40.

³⁰ Bing (2008), 29–30 points out that most Hellenistic book inscriptions are not written by the authors of the works they purport to (re)present. A well-known fictive paratext is Asclepiades' epigram on (and impersonating) Antimachus' *Lyde*, on which see Männlein-Robert (2007b), 176–9; a typical apocryphal one (ἐγὼ δὲ Θεόκριτος, 'but I, Theocritus') is 'Theoc.' AP 9.434, on which see L. Rossi (2001), 343–7. She calls the epigram a 'label', probably written by an undated editor of Theocritus.

³¹ Genette (1997), 164 calls them 'incorporated prefaces'; as examples, he mentions the Homeric poems.

³² The term, if not the phenomenon, ultimately goes back to Theognis' much disputed *sphragis* (vv. 19–26 of the *Corpus Theognideum*), on which see Edmunds (1997) and most extensively Condello (2011).

³³ Strat. AP 12.1 is an Aratean non-invocation of the Muses; Strat. AP 12.2 controls the generic expectations of the reader; Strat. AP 12.258 warns future readers against a biographical reading of his *Boyish Muse* (*Mousa paidike*). Compare also, yet completely out of context, Lucill.

The involvement of the anthologist brings us to another subgroup of 'traditional' paratexts: those that are intrinsically linked to, but not part of, the main text. This category includes such basic features as book titles and the author's name along with prefaces by ancient editors or anthologists. The fourth book of the *Greek Anthology* consists of such proems, detached from their original site. Meleager's introductory poem (AP 4.1 = HE 1) was counter-balanced by an epilogue that is preserved as Meleager AP 12.257 = HE 129; in the original *Garland*, Kathryn Gutzwiller says, 'they were placed outside of the structure of the four epigram books because they concern Meleager's role as editor rather than poet'.³⁴ These paratexts need not be contemporary with the main text; Syrianus' fictive *Phaedo* epigram, AP 9.358, would fall under this category of 'traditional' side-texts, 'traditional' in the sense that it was copied along with (some versions of) the main text in its textual tradition.

(b) 'Editorial' or 'scribal' paratexts, by contrast, are added by the producers (scribes, redactors, collectors, patrons) of a specific manuscript and pertain to the book as a material object and as a unique collection of texts. One should think of dedications (what Genette calls 'inscriptions')³⁵ and prefaces that explain the rationale of the collection or provide guidance for the reader. Unlike 'traditional' paratexts, which often have an undefined origin but may go back to the time when the original text was written, these epigrams were added to the text at the time of the manuscript's production. This is not to say that they were composed for the occasion, since there is a lot of recycling, appropriation, and conventionality in this type of paratext.

(c) 'Post-editorial' paratexts are additions, responses, or comments by later scribes, readers, or owners of the particular manuscripts. They are a kind of immediate 'reader response', the result of the interaction of reading and writing.

5. THE PALATINE ANTHOLOGY AS A REPOSITORY

'The paratext is neither on the interior nor on the exterior: it is both; it is on the threshold; and it is on this very site that we must study it, because essentially, perhaps, *its being depends upon its site*.'³⁶ Genette here stresses

AP 9.572, once the *prooemium* to Lucillius' second book of epigrams, invoking, thanking, and begging Nero. For both Strato and Lucillius, see Floridi (2007; 2014a).

³⁴ Gutzwiller (1998), 279. See also Gutzwiller (1997), 170: 'he poeticizes editorial practice.' On Meleager's *coronis* poem (AP 12.257), see Höschele (2010), 172–6; on Philip's proem (AP 4.2), see Magnelli (2006); on Agathias' preface to the *Cycle* (AP 4.3), see Magnelli (2008); Höschele (2010), 141–5.

³⁵ Genette (1997), 117.

³⁶ Genette (1997), xvii.

that texts (in our case epigrams) become paratexts only through their physical location at the fringes of 'main texts'. In other words, their paratextual 'being', function, and meaning are a corollary of their position in a book as much as of their content. In this final section, I intend to demonstrate, first, that it is rewarding to study epigrams in situ, as they appear in the *manuscript* of the *Palatine Anthology*,³⁷ and, next, that the nature of poems, their textual or paratextual 'being', indeed depends upon and changes with their location, regardless of their original intention.

5.1. Jacobs and the (Non-)Inclusion of Book Epigrams in the Standard Editions of the *Greek Anthology*

The great majority of the epigrams quoted or discussed in this chapter (and in this volume) are known, sometimes exclusively, from the *Greek Anthology*, which basically follows the organization of the Palatine manuscript, itself reflecting the epigram collection of Cephalas (c.900 CE).³⁸ Within the anthology, these epigrams are presented as *literary texts* in their own right. Yet the Palatine manuscript also contains paratextual epigrams. Modern editions of the *Greek Anthology*, the structure and numbering of which go back to Jacobs (1813–17), in principle present the *texts*, giving the paratexts at best in the apparatus.³⁹ Jacobs' editorial decisions on the inclusion or exclusion of an epigram, however, are sometimes questionable.

A first example of such a debatable decision is AP 5.1 (p. 87 of the manuscript): this poem, probably by Cephalas, is not the first erotic epigram but a metrical preface of the anthologist, who explains the pedagogical rationale of his starting with the book of *erotica*:

νέοις ἀνάπτων καρδίας σοφὴν ζέσιν
ἀρχὴν Ἔρωτα τῶν λόγων ποιήσομαι.
πυρσὸν γὰρ οὗτος ἐξανάπτει τοῖς λόγοις.
(Const. Cephalas AP 5.1)

Warming the hearts of youth with learned fervour,
I shall make Eros the beginning of my books,
for it is he who lights the torch of desire for literature.

³⁷ Such a study is now facilitated by the availability of digitized versions at <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/cpgraec23> (*Pal. gr.* 23) and <http://gallica.bnf.fr> (*Supplément grec* 384). The facsimile edition by Preisendanz (1911) is also still useful. In this section I shall adopt Preisendanz's continuous page numbering for the manuscript, which follows the practice in the Heidelberg section; for the Parisian section (AP 14 and 15) I shall also give the folio numbers.

³⁸ For the (still partly unresolved) issue of the lost and surviving anthologies and their relation with Cephalas, see first of all A. Cameron (1993). There is also a fine critical survey in Maltomini (2008), 11–26 and important new insights in Lauxtermann (2007).

³⁹ Thus Beckby (1957–8) and the several volumes of the French Budé (Belles Lettres) edition, e.g. Buffière (1970).

Besides the content and the metre (dodecasyllables), the layout and the script clearly set this epigram apart from the subsequent poems: it is written in uncials and all three verses are preceded by asterisks (*). This, then, is clearly an ‘editorial’ paratext. Other books have similar proems composed by Cephalas (the one in Book 6 manifestly refers back to AP 5.1); being written in prose, however, they did not make it into Jacobs’ numbered sequence.

The other case studies are taken from the final section of the codex, the quaternions 41–4, from which the hotchpotch unduly known as the fifteenth book of the *Greek Anthology* has been selected.⁴⁰ AP 15.1 (p. 664, f. 25v) is a book epigram on the *Descriptio tabulae mundi* by John of Gaza, immediately following John’s poem itself (which occupies quaternion 41 and part of 42), as a metrical postface. Here again, the paratextual status is highlighted through the use of uncials. Hence this is a traditional ‘allographic’ *paratext* in situ—again, not the first of a series of epigrams in literary transmission.⁴¹ Just like AP 5.1, it should not have been part of the *Greek Anthology*, or at least not as the opening poem of a book.

The same quaternion 42 includes the *technopaegnia* (AP 15.21–2, 15.24–7).⁴² In the editions of the *Greek Anthology*, they are curiously interrupted by an epigram on Marcus Aurelius’ *Meditations* (namely anon. AP 15.23).⁴³ The explanation is simple: the redactor of the *Palatine Anthology* started each figure poem on a new page; when much space was left, the Byzantine *horror vacui* induced the scribe to fill it with other texts. This has also happened at page 670 (f. 28v) of the Palatine manuscript beneath Simias’ *Axe* (AP 15.22), where the scribe wrote the epigram *εἰς τὴν βιβλὸν Μάρκου* (‘on the book of Marcus’)—again, in uncials, each verse preceded by marginal signs. We encounter the same phenomenon underneath Dosiadas’ *Altar* (AP 15.26, p. 673, f. 30r), but now without a trace in the (numbering of the) editions of the *Greek Anthology*, since the space is filled with two hexametrical epigrams on Marinus’ *Life of Proclus* that already appear in Book 9a: Marinus AP 9.197 and 9.196 (in this sequence). This is why Jacobs did not repeat them. Not only is the sequence different from that in Book 9a, but the text differs, too (and offers three better readings). The odds are that the scribe of quaternion 42 copied it from a source other than the model of AP 9. This source was probably a manuscript of Proclus,⁴⁴ just as in the case of the Marcus epigram. And, here again, the poems are written in the *Auszeichnungsmajuskel*, as is typical of book epigrams. It is noteworthy that all epigrams discussed here (AP 5.1, 15.1, 15.23, and the unnumbered Marinus poems) were written by the

⁴⁰ For a description of the contents of the whole section, see Buffière (1970), 103–22.

⁴¹ See already Preisendanz (1911), xliii.

⁴² On these poems, see Kwapisz (2013a); AP 15.21 is also discussed by Simone Beta in this volume.

⁴³ A. Cameron (1993), 314–15 ascribes it to Arethas; see also Tissoni (2003), 297–303.

⁴⁴ For a different view, see A. Cameron (1993), 322.

same scribe J, who typically used uncials for titles, lemmata, and authors' names⁴⁵—that is, for paratexts.

The Marinus epigrams are followed by a monostich: *τεχνικοῖς κανόνεσσιν ἐφespόμενος τὰδ' ἔγραψα* ('I wrote these, following technical canons'). Alan Cameron considers the line a composition of J and comments: 'These "technical canons" were surely (as Maas saw) the canons of calligraphy. J is explaining why he has repeated these poems in such an inappropriate context.'⁴⁶ If the verse is indeed by J, I would consider it a positive explanation of the calligraphic script used for the book epigrams, rather than an excuse. But was the verse in fact created by J? It is preceded by an *α*, possibly an abbreviation of *ἄλλο* (that's how Maas transcribes it),⁴⁷ and by an asterisk; and it is hexametrical, just like the preceding poems. The most logical explanation seems to be that the monostich, whatever its precise meaning, was not created for the occasion but was copied by J from his exemplar along with the Marinus poems. In other words, it is not a scribal but a 'traditional' paratext. It should, in that case, have been included in the *Greek Anthology* as an extra epigram between the *technopaegnia*, just like the Marcus epigram.

Quaternion 43 consists of anacreontics; quaternion 44 has epigrams, some of which were included in *AP* 15. The actual order of the sheets is erroneous, owing to a binding error. In its present state, quaternion 44 starts with poems by Gregory of Nazianzus. Pages 691–2 (f. 39r–v) are filled with his *γνώμαι δίστιχοι* ('maxims in two verses'), that is, *carmen* I.2.31 (*PG* 37.910–15)—a section that, according to the description in Buffière, is 'introduced and closed' by the following epigrams:⁴⁸

γνώμαι Γρηγορίου, δίστιχος εὐεπίη
ἐσθλὸν ἄθυρμα νέοις καὶ χάρις ἐξοδίη.

Maxims of Gregory, eloquent distichs,
gentle recreation for young people and a parting gift.

and

ὁ γρήγορος νοῦς, ἡ θεόφθογγος λύρα
ᾗδει τὰ τερπνὰ τῆς ἀληθείας μέλη.

The vigilant mind, the lyre sounding from God
sings the agreeable songs of the truth.

Two paratexts, to be sure, but crucially different. Neither Buffière nor Jacobs (to whom Buffière refers) notice that the first pentametrical epigram is in fact the acrostic of Gregory's poem itself:⁴⁹ this, therefore, is an original, 'authorial', 'incorporated' paratext. The second epigram, in dodecasyllables and with a

⁴⁵ Preisendanz (1911), lxxviii.

⁴⁶ A. Cameron (1993), 321; Maas (1913), 296.

⁴⁷ Maas (1913), 296. The second Marinus epigram is preceded by *ἄλλο(ς)*, written in full.

⁴⁸ Buffière (1970), 107 n. 1.

⁴⁹ Preisendanz (1911), xlv n. 1, does.

common pun on Gregory's name, is an anonymous laudatory book epigram of a recognizable format: compare Geometres' very similar distich quoted in note 23.

In the intended order, quaternion 44 opened with *AP* 15.40, an awkward hexametrical paraphrase of the Johannine resurrection of Lazarus composed by Cometas, the self-confident editor of Homer whom we met before. The poem is 'awkward' not (just) from a modern point of view: I added some iambic comments in the margins of page 705 (f. 46r), characteristically written in uncials. Next to a monostich (ἄκοσμα ταῦτα τοῦ Κομητᾶ πάντ' ἔπη, 'all these verses by Cometas are rubbish') comes a satirical poem in five verses. The monostich is preparing the poem in that it includes a lexical allusion to the Iliadic description of Thersites, notably at *Iliad* 2.213 (ὃς ἔπεα φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἄκοσμα τέ πολλά τε ἦδ' ἔπη, 'who had his mind filled with a store of unruly words').⁵⁰ It cannot be a coincidence that two words (ἄκοσμα and ἔπη/ἔπεα) are identical, given that Cometas will be compared to Thersites in the subsequent poem, which runs as follows:⁵¹

Κομητά, Θερσίτης μὲν ἦσθα. πῶς δέ γε
 Ἀχιλλέως πρόσωπον εἰσέδους, τάλαν;
 ἄπαγε ταῦτα τῆς ἀμούσου καρδίας
 καὶ βάλλε γ' ἐς κόρακας ἢ κύφων ὕπερ
 τὰ κοπρίας γέμοντα σαθρίαν ἔπη.

5

Cometas, you were another Thersites. So, how
 did you dare to impersonate Achilles, you wretch?
 To hell with these products of an unpoetic mind!
 Go and be hanged, throw them over your hump,
 these verses full of the rottenness of dung!⁵²

The impersonation of Achilles probably refers to Cometas' clumsy use of epic hexameters. I take the second half of the fourth verse to be another allusion to Homer's description of Thersites at *Iliad* 2.219 (τῷ δέ οἱ ὦμω κυρτῷ ἐπὶ στῆθος συνοχωκότε, 'rounded shoulders hunched over his chest'). The verse has, moreover, an untranslatable wordplay with βάλλε, which is both part of the common Aristophanic expression used in imprecations⁵³ and employed transitively with the final verse as its object. This piece of literary polemic enriched by Homeric metaphors and allusions is one of the wittiest poems in

⁵⁰ As far as I know, this has remained unnoticed. A. Cameron (1993), 309–10 rightly pointed out the pun on the victim's name in the monostich (ἄκοσμα . . . Κομητᾶ) and in the variant that I wrote next to *AP* 15.37 (the poem quoted at the beginning of this chapter): Κομητά, ταῦτα δυσκόμιστα πάντ' ἔπη ('Cometas, all these verses are intolerable').

⁵¹ Edited in the apparatuses of Beckby (1957–8) and Buffière (1970), and by Pontani (1982), 252–3; discussed in Lauxtermann (2003), 109.

⁵² Translation from Lauxtermann (2003), 109, except for v. 4, which I translated myself.

⁵³ See *LSJ* s.v. κόραξ I. Aristophanes uses the expression βάλλε ἐς κόρακας dozens of times (often without the verb), e.g. at *Pl.* 782 and *Th.* 1079.

the final section of the Palatine manuscript; but, since it is only ‘scribal’ paratext in the margins, it is relegated to the critical apparatus (and hence not included in the *TLG*).

In conclusion, if we were to organize the epigrams in the *Greek Anthology* anew today, we would include either more or fewer poems than there are in the standard numbering set by Jacobs.

5.2. Changing Locations, Shifting Functions

The second point to be illustrated with material from the *Greek Anthology* is that the function of an epigram—textual or paratextual—is flexible. Apart from exceptions, some of which have been discussed in section 5.1, the epigrams on authors and books in the Palatine manuscript belong to the main text: they are transmitted as literary poems, regardless of their original function and their source (i.e. regardless of whether they were copied from earlier anthologies or directly found in situ). Yet, in other, usually later manuscripts, (versions of) the same epigrams fulfil other functions. Authorial intention and actual use do not always coincide.

Let us consider some Homeric examples. *AP* 9.385, ascribed to Stephanus Grammaticus, is an alphabetical acrostic in twenty-four hexameters on the *Iliad*. Within the *Greek Anthology* it is an epideictic epigram, but the same verses are also used as metrical headings of the Homeric books in numerous manuscripts. Was the poem assembled from preexisting book titles? Or were the book titles excerpted from the schoolish list epigram?⁵⁴ We cannot give an affirmative answer.

Several Homeric manuscripts include (series of) book epigrams. Unexpectedly, perhaps, all kinds of epigrams are reused to accompany the epics, including ones that have no immediate link to the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*: we find epitaphs, riddles from the biographic tradition, laudatory epigrams on Homer or his homeland(s), ethopoietic poems impersonating Homeric characters, and so on. One notable example is a group of Homeric epigrams written after the end of the *Iliad* in the manuscript *Ambrosiana I 4 sup.* (D 1276); there are no fewer than eleven epigrams in a row.⁵⁵ They are all known from the *Greek Anthology*, specifically from Books 7, 9, 14, and 16. Leonidas of Tarentum *AP* 9.24 = *HE* 30 is the first epigram in the series, and four consecutive poems correspond to adjacent poems from the *Planudean Anthology* (*AP* 298, 302, 300, and 304). Another remarkable fact: the eleven epigrams are roughly in alphabetical order, on the basis of their incipit (*A* to *H*).

⁵⁴ See L. Rossi (2002), 169.

⁵⁵ On this cycle, preserved in slightly divergent selections in five manuscripts, see now Maltomini (2015).

A telling example of the functional *and* textual fluidity of book epigrams is the anonymous AP 9.583, a poem on Thucydides, in which the book itself speaks. It is the last poem of the epideictic section in the *Greek Anthology*:

ὦ φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δέ γε πάμπαν
νῆις ἔφυσ Μουσέων, ῥῦψον, ἃ μὴ νοεῖς.
εἰμὶ γὰρ οὐ πάντεσσι βατός, παῦροι δ' ἀγάσαντο
Θουκυδίδην Ὀλόρου, Κεκροπίδην τὸ γένος.
(anon. AP 9.583)

My friend, if you are learned, take me in your hands; but if you are wholly ignorant of the Muses, cast away what you cannot understand.
I am not accessible to all, but the few admire
Thucydides, son of Olorus, by birth an Athenian.

In the Palatine manuscript, the epigram was inserted in the space left blank because of the lacuna between Books 9a and 9b of AP. It was written, again, by J, in uncials. He must have found the epigram not in a Cephalan anthology but directly in a manuscript of Thucydides, as convincingly argued by Cameron.⁵⁶ Indeed, several manuscripts of the historian have this same epigram at the beginning or at the end, most often in a version closer to that of the AP (which does go back to Cephala) rather than to that of the AP. However, the most remarkable textual variant is found in a medical codex, the *Vat. Urb. Gr. 67*. The epigram, in the fifteenth-century part of the composite codex, starts here with ὦ φίλος εἰ ἰητρός εἶ ('My friend if you're a doctor') and the final verse reads παῦροι δ' ἀγάσαντο Γαληνὸν ἐκ Περγάμου πατρίδος ('the few admire Galen, whose homeland is Pergamum').⁵⁷ This is an interesting example of a phenomenon mentioned before: book epigrams are used and reused, recycled, appropriated, and adapted, they are 'living', 'open', or 'fluid' texts. One side result of the changes is that the metre is completely disturbed.

Let us end our discussion with some epigrams on Lycophron, another author 'not accessible to all'. Despite his canonical status in Byzantium, in several manuscripts his *Alexandra* is followed by rather unflattering epigrams. The scholiast Isaac Tzetzes, for instance, curses the 'stupid' poet for his 'graceless words and barbaric verses, vain nonsense only making young readers sweat' (λόγους ἀτερπεῖς . . . γράφεις, | . . . βάρβαρα πλέξας ἔπη, | μόνον νέοις ἰδρώτα, μωρὲ Ἀνκόφρον· | . . . κενοὶ λήρων λόγοι).⁵⁸ Lycophron's obscurity is, understandably, an issue in most of the (at least) fourteen different

⁵⁶ A. Cameron (1993), 105–6. This was also how J found the Marinus and the Marcus epigrams; see section 5.1 here.

⁵⁷ See discussion in Mondrain (2000), 242–3. The adaptation seems to be the work of Demetrius Angelus.

⁵⁸ The text (slightly adapted) is by Dübner and Cougny (1871–90), 3: 5.50, and it is preserved in at least four manuscripts. See discussion in De Stefani and Magnelli (2009), 615–16.

epigrams attached to his work in the manuscripts. One of them is also preserved in the *Greek Anthology*:

οὐκ ἂν ἐν ἡμετέροισι πολυγνάμπτοις λαβυρίνθοις
 ῥηιδίως προμόλοις ἐς φάος, αἶ κε τύχης·
 τοίους γὰρ Πριαμὶς Κασάνδρῃ φοίβασε μύθους,
 ἄγγελος οὗς βασιλεῖ ἔφρασε λοξοτρόχῃς.
 εἰ δέ σε φίλατο Καλλιόπη, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δὲ
 νῆις ἔφης Μουσέων, χερσὶ βάρους φορέεις. 5
 (anon. AP 9.191)

Not easily, being in my labyrinth of many turnings,
 would you find your way to the light, if at all:
 such is the prophetic message that Cassandra, Priam's daughter,
 tells to the king in crooked speech.
 Yet, if Calliope loves you, take me in your hands; but if
 you are ignorant of the Muses, I am a weight in your hands.

Knowledgeable readers will have recognized the borrowings from Lycophron's *Alexandra* 1467–8 in verses 3–4; even those ignorant of the Muses will have seen that the last distich is a variation on the first distich of the Thucydides epigram (anon. AP 9.583). It is impossible to account for the interdependence of the two anonymous poems. We may try to explain, however, what induced the fifteenth-century scribe and scholar Constantine Lascaris to have AP 9.191, a fitting postface to the *Alexandra*, curiously followed by AP 9.506, the epigram on Sappho that opened this chapter.⁵⁹ There is a thematic link, to be sure: the Muses. Moreover, and more importantly perhaps, unlike the Palatine manuscript, the two epigrams follow each other in the *Planudean Anthology* within the section Ia, εἰς ποιητάς ('on poets').⁶⁰ The collections issuing from Cephala's magisterial enterprise continued to be used as a treasure trove.

⁵⁹ In Madrid, BN 4551—a manuscript wholly devoted to Lycophron.

⁶⁰ Beckby (1957–8), 4: 562. Lascaris was also the redactor of a collection of some 500 epigrams, largely taken from the *Greek Anthology*: Madrid, BN 4562 (on which see Maltomini 2011).

Part 2

Imitation, Variation, Interaction

Miniaturization of Earlier Poetry in Greek Epigrams

Annette Harder

1. INTRODUCTION

In later antiquity there seems to be a notion that, from a generic and thematic point of view, almost anything goes in epigram, provided that the poems are short and in elegiacs—or, less frequently, in hexameters. As I have argued elsewhere, ‘[a]pparently epigram was more and more regarded as a short poem in its own right in which the limitations of its inscriptional origin were no longer felt and there was room for generic experiments and a general widening of scope as the genre became more bookish’.¹ If we look at the epigrams in chronological order, we can observe a long and gradual process of increasing variety.

Generally speaking, already in the earlier Hellenistic epigrams from the first half of the third century BCE we see that the scope is somewhat widened in relation to that of inscriptions, in which funeral, dedicatory, and honorific texts were the most common. If we follow the ordering of Callimachus’ epigrams in Gow and Page’s (1965) edition, we may distinguish roughly four groups of epigrams (which, however, do not necessarily offer an exhaustive picture of the poet’s epigrammatic production): erotic and/or sympotic, dedicatory and/or ecphrastic, funerary, and a group of various epigrams including some about literature. An important new element here is obviously the erotic and sympotic epigram, which clearly abandons the illusion of an

¹ Harder (2007), 411; see also e.g. Rosenmeyer (2002), 138, who argues in an article about epistolary epigrams that, ‘many of these later epigrams were composed as sophisticated and allusive miniatures, intended primarily for a book reader’s eyes, and thus “fictional” in nature’. Another subgenre of epigram that flourished particularly in the later generations is skoptic epigram; see e.g. Blomqvist (1998), 45–60. On Greek skoptic epigram in Roman times, see Nisbet (2003); Floridi (2014a), 9–39.

inscriptional character and shows some resemblance to the interests of archaic lyric and elegiac poetry.² In addition, the epigrams about literature and some others in the category of 'various' epigrams³ also suggest a certain widening in scope, probably facilitated by the medium of the book. Asclepiades' poems present a roughly similar picture but have a much stronger focus on the erotic epigrams, which may have been 'invented' by him and form the majority of his corpus. In their thematic variety, Posidippus' epigrams are closer to the ones composed by Callimachus, and their grouping in the Milan Papyrus (*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309*) offers evidence of the development of new subgenres, even though many of his poems can still be grouped under the headings of funeral, dedicatory, and ecphrastic epigrams. Particularly, sections like the *Oionoskopika* (21–35 A–B) look like a new development.⁴ The small collection of epigrams attributed to Theocritus is also varied, but it differs from those of the other poets: there are no examples of the sympotic or erotic epigram, but instead there are several so-called bucolic epigrams as well as a small group of epigrams on poets of the past such as Anacreon, Archilochus, and Hipponax (presented as ecphrases of statues or as epitaphs).⁵

Then, in the generation of epigrammatists active in the second half of the third century BCE, we see that the scope of epigram widens considerably as to the topics that are dealt with and as to the earlier literary genres that it evokes. Thus, for instance, poets like Alcaeus of Messene, Damagetus, and Dioscorides wrote epigrams on political and topical subjects in a manner that was not yet found among the poets of the first half of the third century BCE⁶ and in this way seem to relate epigram more and more to the tradition of early lyric, iambic, and elegiac poetry and recall both the thematic interests and the generic forms of poets like Alcaeus, Archilochus, Tyrtaeus, and Solon. Another subject that receives a great deal of attention among this group of poets is literary criticism in a broad sense. We can also see a concern with the establishment of a canon of earlier poetry and literary genres, poets taking a position in relation to the

² On this topic, see Bowie (2007), 95–112; there are also many references to the influence of archaic lyric on epigram in Kanellou (2012), 213–27 and *passim*.

³ Apart from the anecdote about Pittacus (Call. *AP* 7.89 = *HE* 54), we find these epigrams mainly among the fragmentary ones, such as Call. *HE* 64 = fr. 393 Pf., probably from a skoptic epigram about the philosopher Diodorus of Iasus, and Call. *HE* 69 = fr. 400 Pf., which looks like part of a propempticon.

⁴ On the *Oionoskopika*, see now Baumbach (2015), 113–53.

⁵ For a detailed discussion of Theocritus' epigrams, see L. Rossi (2001).

⁶ E.g. Alc. Mess. *HE* 1–5 (= *AP* 9.518, 9.519, 11.12, 7.247, and *AP* 5) and Damag. *HE* 4–6 (= *AP* 7.231, 7.438, and 7.541) contain references to Philip V of Macedonia and the wars in Greece in the late third century BCE. In these epigrams Alcaeus in particular is very critical of the king. Dioscorides *AP* 6.126 = *HE* 15 is a dedicatory epigram about a Cretan soldier's weapons and touches on the subject of war in general. Although earlier poets such as Callimachus and Posidippus also refer to contemporary events in their epigrams, their poems are restricted to the achievements of the Ptolemies and take on a laudatory tone rather than getting involved in politics.

tradition and showing this in the contents of their epigrams and in the way they recall other genres in their short poems. As part of this process, there is an increasing focus on earlier poets.⁷

In this chapter I address the question of how several of these new developments in the creative reception of earlier poetry began in the epigrams of the first generation of epigrammatists and progressed from there, and special attention will be paid to the ways in which generic aspects and contents were explored and to the reception of earlier poetic genres as a kind of ‘miniaturization’, particularly of smaller genres (there will also be a brief excursus on didactic poetry at the end). The points of contact between epigrams and other literary genres, in form or content or both, have already been explored in a number of articles in the *Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip*.⁸ Here we find articles discussing the connections between, say, epigram and epic, lyric poetry, and drama; epigram and epinician, bucolic, elegiac, or iambic poetry; epigram and philosophy; epigram and visual art.⁹ However, the focus in these articles is on specific groups of epigrams as they appear in Meleager’s and Philip’s *Garlands*, and there is no strong diachronic perspective on any distinction between generations of epigrammatists or developments in the course of time. The questions addressed in this chapter, by contrast, have a diachronic emphasis: Do we find hints of this later kind of generic variety and of a thematic widening of scope already in Callimachus and among his contemporaries? Does their poetry foreshadow new developments? How did it go on from there? In order to answer these questions, I first focus on the corpus of epigrams composed by Callimachus and his contemporaries—such as Theocritus, Asclepiades, and Posidippus—in an Alexandrian context, bearing in mind of course that, except in the case of Posidippus, what we have got is usually just a selection from the poets’ corpus made by later anthologists.¹⁰ These selections may to a certain extent reflect the anthologists’ tastes and not be entirely representative of the original collections of epigrams, as can be seen now in the case of Posidippus

⁷ On the epigrammatists of the second half of the third century BCE in general and for a more elaborate discussion of these issues, see Harder (forthcoming). A typical example of epigrammatists’ treatment of earlier literature is Dioscorides *AP* 7.351 = *HE* 17, where Lycambes’ daughters protest against Archilochus, defending themselves and accusing him of malevolent slander.

⁸ Bing and Bruss (2007a).

⁹ On the connection between skoptic epigram and visual art, see also Floridi’s chapter in this volume.

¹⁰ On this point, see e.g. Argentieri (2007), 153, who observes that in his *Garland* Meleager left out the court poems of Posidippus’ *Hippika* and *Lithika*. For Callimachus, we may have roughly between one third and a half of his epigrammatic production: the *HE* contains seventy epigrams (including the fragments), while on the basis of Marianus’ iambic metaphrasis of Callimachus’ epigrams in 800 lines one may infer a total number of c.150–200 epigrams; for this calculation, see Parsons (2002), 100–1 n. 6.

(*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII* 309).¹¹ At the same time, however, even these selections show differences and similarities between the early epigrammatists and the later generations, so there seems to be a basis for using them for the kind of diachronic investigation that I attempt here. My starting point will be the question of whether the collection of epigrams of the first generation of Hellenistic poets, as we have it, already presents a picture of generic and thematic variety and an interest in playing with the basic features and contents of smaller poetic forms of earlier generations, such as lyric, iambic, and elegiac poetry, or even with those of contemporary bucolic poetry and of the somewhat longer (but still not *very* long) works of didactic poetry. One may, then, inquire whether and, if so, how these epigrams inspired later generations of epigrammatists and contributed to the development of a practice of shifting boundaries and increasing emancipation from the conventions of inscriptions, which paved the way for further freedom to experiment. In studying these issues, I look particularly at the ways in which these developments led to a tendency to write epigrams that took the shape of ‘miniature versions’ of earlier genres meant for oral performance. After describing the state of affairs among the early epigrammatists, I add brief sketches of the ways in which this idea of literary ‘miniaturization’ was picked up or elaborated upon by later generations.

2. EPIGRAMS AS MINIATURES

The concept of epigrams as ‘miniatures’ of (parts of) other genres was first raised and discussed in relation to Greek comedy and tragedy, and this in turn suggested the idea of looking at it from the perspectives of other genres as well.

As to comedy, a good example of this technique has been found in Asclepiades’ epigrams, for example in *AP* 5.181 = *HE* 25 and *AP* 5.185 = *HE* 26,¹² where the way in which a master gives instructions to a slave for buying provisions for a dinner party owes much to comedy,¹³ and in Posidippus *AP* 5.183 = *HE* 10 = 124 A–B, which is a similar kind of monologue, delivered

¹¹ For a useful brief survey of the kinds of epigrams in Posidippus’ collection in relation to the epigrams of other poets as collected by the anthologists, see Parsons (2002), 122–3.

¹² For a discussion of these two epigrams in relation to comedy and mime, see Bettenworth (2002), 37; Sens (2011), 161–3 and 173–5. Gow and Page (1965), 2: 132, on Asclep. *AP* 5.181 = *HE* 25, already speak about ‘thumb-nail mimes’, which ‘seem modelled on scenes from Comedy or Mime’, and adduce some further examples of this type of epigram, among which Asclep. *AP* 5.185 and Posidipp. *AP* 5.183 are somewhat less elaborate examples from the early third century BCE. For epigrams related to mime, Maria Kanellou draws my attention to Posidipp. *AP* 5.213 = *HE* 4, with Tarán (1979), 86–8; anon. *AP* 12.116 = *HE* 34, with Tarán (1979), 77–8; Mel. *AP* 12.117 = *HE* 19, where, according to Tarán (1979), 168, ‘the language of the mime is used for the soliloquy of a drunken lover’ (see also Tarán’s analysis on 101–4); and Mel. *AP* 5.177 = *HE* 37 and *AP* 5.178 = *HE* 38, mentioned by Tarán (1979), 31 n. 45.

¹³ For references to examples of this kind of scene in comedy, see Sens (2011), 161–2.

by a host who sends a boy to acquire more wine. Another Posidippean epigram (*HE* 16 = 121 A–B) is about the death of a parasite called Phryomachus and thus uses a stock character from comedy.¹⁴ Although these epigrams could be classified as ‘sympotic’, they present interesting examples of a certain mixing of genres, while the influence of comedy seems undeniable. Later epigrammatists seem to have picked up this idea, as we find instructions for a dinner also in Philodemus *AP* 11.35 = *GPh* 22 and small ‘comic scenes’ in Antiphrilos *AP* 5.308 = *GPh* 14, Diotimus *AP* 5.106 = *GPh* 1, and Philodemus *AP* 5.46 = *GPh* 4.¹⁵

In an even more subtle way, Callimachus *AP* 7.517 = *HE* 32, which is about the girl Basilo killing herself after the funeral of her brother Melanippus, their father’s bereavement, and the mourning of the whole city, may recall tragedy, and in particular Sophocles’ *Antigone*, as was argued by Annemarie Ambühl.¹⁶ She observed that the epigram, as a narrative that looked back on the events of a single day, could be read as a messenger speech or as an epilogue delivered by a chorus and that the theme of burial and subsequent suicide to a certain extent recalls the plot of the *Antigone*. This epigram shows some affinity with Posidippus 50 A–B,¹⁷ which describes how, as in Callimachus’ epigram, the whole town is in mourning since Hetion buried his daughter Hedeia, ‘at whose tomb Hymenaeus knocked with his hands, not at the door of her chamber’ (ἦς Ὑμέναιος | ἡρίον οὐ θαλάμου χερσὶν ἔκοιψε πύλην, vv. 3–4)¹⁸ — which in turn indicates that she died at the age of marriage or, possibly, shortly before her wedding. Here too one may remember Sophocles’ *Antigone*, where the notion of the tomb as a bridal chamber, which in Posidippus is hinted at through the juxtaposition ἡρίον οὐ θαλάμου (‘tomb, not chamber’, v. 4), is clearly present, for instance, in *Antigone*’s words when she mourns her own early death (v. 891): ὦ τύμβος, ὦ νυμφεῖον (‘O tomb, o bridal chamber’).¹⁹

These attempts to miniaturize scenes from comedy and tragedy seem like innovative and refined experiments within the boundaries of epigram, as they remain more or less within the framework of sympotic and funeral epigram,

¹⁴ On this epigram and possible affinities with Call. *AP* 7.725 = *HE* 42, see Lelli (2005), 108–9.

¹⁵ In addition, the epigrams that draw from and are miniatures of the paraklausithyra (see section 3.3) may to a certain extent be indebted to comedy; see Sens (2011), xlv–xlvii.

¹⁶ See Ambühl (2002), 9–11.

¹⁷ This was also noticed by Lelli (2005), 103–4.

¹⁸ All translations of Posidippus’ poems are from Austin and Bastianini (2002), occasionally slightly adapted. The Greek texts are from Gow and Page (1965; 1968) and Austin and Bastianini (2002). Another poem that may be compared is Theoc. (or Leon.?) *AP* 7.662 = Theoc. *HE* 9, about a seven-year-old girl who died because she was missing her brother, who himself died when he was just twenty months old; there is a reference to their mother’s suffering in vv. 5–6.

¹⁹ The roots of the motif go back to inscriptions. See e.g. *CEG* I 24 (as Ivana Petrovic reminds me). On Posidipp. 50 A–B, see also Meyer’s discussion in this volume. As Maria Kanellou suggests, by echoing Sophocles’ *Antigone*, Posidippus seems to refresh the topos of a girl who died unmarried, which is attested in literary epigram already in Anyt. *AP* 7.486 = *HE* 5, *AP* 7.490 = *HE* 6, *AP* 7.646 = *HE* 7, and *AP* 7.649 = *HE* 8.

both familiar forms of the genre, the sympotic as a recent and very popular development, the funeral as part of a long tradition of funeral inscriptions. On the other hand, they present a special form of literary reception and incorporation of other literary genres by isolating sympotic scenes from comedy, or narratives and laments about the death of young people from tragedy, and turning them into something much smaller. As already mentioned, these observations raise the question of whether a similar kind of miniaturization of other forms of poetry can also be detected in epigram and, if so, how this developed over time.²⁰

3. SHORTER FORMS RECURRING AS MINIATURES IN EPIGRAM

Explicit references to archaic lyric, iambic, and elegiac poets are relatively scarce among the epigrammatists of the early third century BCE, but they become much more frequent among later generations.²¹ In the early generations, we find more subtle ways of referring to and adapting material from these poets, which are then picked up and elaborated upon by later generations. As indicated in the preceding section, isolated passages of longer poems may lend themselves to miniaturization, and in fact a number of examples suggest that the poets of Callimachus' generation were experimenting with this possibility also in connection with shorter poems.²² Besides, we shall see that not only archaic poetry but also later short poems, such as bucolic poetry, begin to lend themselves to miniaturization.²³

²⁰ In this respect, it may be worth noticing that the concept of the messenger speech taken in isolation, which may be behind Call. *AP* 7.517 = *HE* 32, also inspired Lycophron in his *Alexandra*, a messenger speech not reduced, but extended into a poem of the length of a whole tragedy. The fact that evidence of collections of selections from tragedies, such as e.g. *P. Hamb.* 118–19, with prologues of Euripides, is found on papyri as early as the third century BCE (see e.g. Harder 1985, 141–3) suggests that the idea of taking scenes in isolation was current at the time of these Hellenistic poets. We do not really find these kinds of miniatures of narrative epic in epigrams of the early Hellenistic period, and this may be accounted for by the fact that one could perhaps more easily isolate relatively short scenes in drama.

²¹ An exception is Leonidas of Tarentum, who has quite a number of references to these poets; see Leon. *AP* 9.24 = *HE* 30, *AP* 7.19 = *HE* 57, *AP* 7.408 = *HE* 58, *API* 307 = *HE* 90, *AP* 7.13 = *HE* 98, and *AP* 7.35 = *HE* 99. Some other early examples are Noss. *AP* 7.718 = *HE* 11 and Theoc. *HE* 13–15; see also Gabathuler (1937).

²² In fact the experiments went both ways, as we can see in the *Aetia*, where we have examples of longer poems that may be read as elaborations of different subgenres of epigrams, such as Call. fr. 64 Pf. (funeral epigram), fr. 114 Pf. (ecphrastic epigram), and fr. 110 Pf. (dedicatory epigram), and possibly the *Victoria Berenices* frs 54–60j Pf. as a mix of a victory epigram and an epinician poem; for further discussion, see Parsons (2002), 128–30; Harder (2012) ad loc.

²³ In order to fit the compass of this chapter, I shall give only a few examples, but I am sure that more can be found through a more systematic search. For instance, the connection between

3.1. Narrative Elegy

A number of epigrams are presented as short narratives, often about death, and may therefore in a certain way be regarded as miniatures of narrative elegy.²⁴ This primarily concerns the way in which these epigrams are telling a ‘story’, which contains a distinct narrative plot, however brief and simple. The actual content, meaning the subject of the story, is not necessarily exclusively that of narrative elegy but might have its roots in heroic epic, though the elegiac metre would point to narrative elegy rather than epic. For instance, we find brief narratives about the death of heroes at war in relation to bad omens in Posidippus 32 and 33 A–B, of which the first epigram may serve as our example:

Ἀντιμάχ[ω σπ]εύδοντι τὸν Ἰλλυρικὸν ποτ[ὶ δῆμον
 τεύχεα κα[ὶ ζώσ]τρας ἐξέφερεν θεράπων
 ἀμφὶ δὲ λαῖν[έην] οἴκου μέσσαυλον ὀλισθὼν
 ἤριπεν· Ἀντ[ιμάχ]ου δ' ἦτορ ἀνετράπετο
 οἶωνῳ θεράποντος, ὃς αὐτίκα τὸν βαρὺν ἦρω
 ἐκ δῆιων ὀλίγην ἦλθεν ἄγων σποδίην.

5

(Posidipp. 32 A–B)

As Antimachus was rushing against the Illyrian [enemy]
 his servant brought out his arms and belt.
 Slipping at the stone door in the inner court of the house
 he fell. Antimachus' heart was perturbed
 at the omen of the servant, who forthwith came back from the enemy
 with the weighty hero reduced to a small heap of ashes.

This epigram may be read as an epitaph for the hero Antimachus, but it is included in the section on omens in Posidippus' collection and in fact consists of a brief narrative with various descriptive details, which add vividness to the scene: Antimachus' eagerness to fight (v. 1) and his strong emotion when he sees his servant falling and seems to guess what that means (vv. 4–5), the various items carried by the servant (v. 2) and his fall (v. 3), and the pathetic conclusion about the big hero being reduced to a small pile of ashes, carried home by his servant (vv. 5–6). In a similar way, 33 A–B tells us a story and evokes pathos for Aristoxeinus, who was misled

longer ecphrases (e.g., in Hellenistic poetry, the description of Jason's cloak at A.R. *Argon.* 1.721–68, or of the cup at Theoc. *Id.* 1.27–56) and miniature ones in epigram, particularly of Posidippus, would be worth investigating; for some relevant remarks on this topic, see L. Rossi (2001), 21–5; Parsons (2002), 124. Another object of research could be the relation of epinician epigrams (and inscriptions) to epinician poetry; on epinician epigram in general, see Köhnken (2007).

²⁴ For a brief survey of narrative elegy and further references, see Harder (2012), 1: 30–1.

by an overambitious dream about (the virgin goddess) Athena, in which he slept at Olympus as her bridegroom but fell in a battle instead. Here the pathos and irony are stressed already in the first verse, in which the dream is said to be ‘beyond his capacities’ (μειζόν . . . ἐνύπνιον ἢ καθ’ ἐωυτόν), by the fact that he is called νήπιος (‘foolish’, v. 2) and by the emphasis on his fatal competing with the gods (v. 7), which made him a ‘pseudo-bridegroom’ (ψευδὴς νυμφίος, v. 8).²⁵ In these examples it is clearly the presentation of the epigram as a narrative with a ‘plot’ that relates them to narrative elegy. At the same time, however, as the epigrams’ subject is the death of warriors, there are also present influences of funeral epigrams and inscriptions for dead soldiers (whose *arete* and weapons are often mentioned),²⁶ elegies encouraging brave behaviour in battle (like Tyrtaeus’ elegies), historical elegies (like Simonides’ elegiac poem on the battle of Plataea), and heroic epic.

Other examples from Posidippus relate to a more domestic sphere. Here—apart from the influence of inscribed epigram—the content may have been inspired by elegies on more personal themes, such as Mimnermus’ poems on old age or the mythological stories in Antimachus’ *Lyde* or Callimachus’ *Aetia*.²⁷ Thus in Posidippus 58 A–B we have a short biography of a woman called Protis, who died after fifty years of marriage, and in AP 7.170 = HE 21 = 131 A–B a story about a three-year-old boy who drowned in a well.²⁸ Also Callimachus AP 7.517 = HE 32 and Posidippus 50 A–B, already discussed in relation to drama, from another point of view, may be regarded as brief elegiac narratives and thus, like the epigrams on heroes previously discussed, show multiple influences. Formally these epigrams may be related to funerary inscribed epigram because they are all about deaths, but their narrative character suggests that they are probably not real inscriptions on tombs and should rather be regarded as small-scale stories.

Among later generations of epigrammatists, this kind of miniature elegiac narrative acquired great popularity, as we find many examples, particularly of brief narratives about death. A good example is the following epigram, composed by Antipater of Thessalonica, about a poor man’s suicide:²⁹

²⁵ I thank Maria Kanellou for her suggestions regarding this epigram.

²⁶ For examples and discussion, see Barbantani (2014); Harder (forthcoming). On military epitaphs, see also Barbantani’s chapter in this volume.

²⁷ Particularly the *Aetia* includes domestic elements, e.g. a young child’s death (frs 25e–31b Pf.) or a mother who accidentally causes her son’s death (frs 102–102a Pf.).

²⁸ AP 7.170 is attributed to both Posidippus and Callimachus in P; Gow and Page (1965), 2: 501 tend to follow earlier scholars, who thought that it was composed by neither Posidippus nor Callimachus. Lelli (2005), 105 n. 102 argues against the attribution to Posidippus on the basis of this poet’s religious views. For further discussion of this epigram, see Hunter’s chapter in this volume.

²⁹ A few other examples are Antip. Thess. AP 9.407 = GPh 34 (about a child’s death) and AP 9.309 = GPh 64 (an old woman’s death); Antiphan. AP 9.245 = GPh 3 (a bride’s

εἶχεν Ἀριστείδης ὁ βοκέρριος οὐκ ἀπὸ πολλῶν
πολλά, μῆς δ' ὅιος καὶ βοὸς εὐπορίην,
ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐδ' ὁ πένης ἔφυγε φθόνον, ἥματι δ' αὐτῶ
θῆρες ὄιν, τὴν βοῦν δ' ὤλεσε δυστοκίη.
μισήσας δ' ἀβλήχες ἐπαύλιον, ἄμματι πῆρης
ἐκ ταύτης βιοτὴν ἀχράδος ἐκρέμασεν.

5

(Antip. Thess. AP 9.149 = *GPh* 68)

Aristides the < > had not much or from many sources,
but provision enough from a single sheep and cow.
Yet not even the pauper escaped Envy: on the same day,
wild beasts killed his sheep and a hard birth killed his cow.
In disgust with a farm where no sheep bleated, with the strap from his wallet
he hanged his life from this wild pear-tree.³⁰

As in the earlier examples, we see a vivid use of narrative details: a brief characterization of the poor farmer, just able to manage (vv. 1–2); a brief reflection on envy and details about the death of the two animals (vv. 3–4); an evocation of the farmer's despair at the now silent farm (v. 5), and finally the detail that he hangs himself from the strap of his *πήρη*, a typical rustic attribute, which adds a further touch of characterization (vv. 5–6). Thus, in a brief compass, the farmer's death effectively evokes pathos, as the narrative details help the reader to form a picture of him and lead to the sad climax of the story.

In the course of time this subgenre of epigram, as one might almost call it, came to cover related subjects as well. Thus we find brief narratives about the death of animals,³¹ the birth of children, or the rescue of children or old people instead of death,³² and a combination of these elements in Philip AP 9.22 = *GPh* 36, which is about the prevention of the sacrifice of a pregnant cow. Also, brief narratives about mythical themes and subjects are found in later epigram, as for example in Archias AP 7.147 = *GPh* 16, where Ajax' story is told in *du-Stil* (i.e. in the second person singular).³³

death); Apollonid. AP 7.389 = *GPh* 6 (the death of four sons); Bianor AP 7.644 = *GPh* 4 (a mother's death).

³⁰ All translations from Philip's *Garland* are from Gow and Page (1968).

³¹ E.g. about mice in Antiphil. AP 9.86 = *GPh* 34, which describes the death of a mouse in a mousetrap and is thus thematically close to Call. *Aetia* fr. 54c Pf. on Molorchus preparing mousetraps, and Antiphil. AP 9.310 = *GPh* 41; about deer in Apollonid. AP 9.244 = *GPh* 16. On epitaphs for animals in general, see Garulli (2014a).

³² E.g. Antip. Thess. AP 9.46 = *GPh* 104 about a birth; Apollonid. AP 9.228 = *GPh* 14 about a son wrongly supposed dead; Parmen. AP 9.114 = *GPh* 9 about the saving of a child; Phil. AP 6.203 = *GPh* 76 about the healing of an old woman.

³³ See Harder (2007), 422–5 for more examples of epigrams with brief narratives related to the Trojan War; Harder (2017) on epigrams with speeches by Homeric characters.

3.2. Bucolic Poetry

Another interesting subgroup is the bucolic epigrams that may be read as miniatures of bucolic poems such as Theocritus' *Idylls*;³⁴ this group shows that the technique of miniaturization could be applied to post-archaic poetry. In Callimachus, we have a good example of this subgroup in *AP* 7.518, a poem about the goatherd Astacides, who was abducted by a nymph:

Ἀστακίδην τὸν Κρήτα τὸν αἰπόλον ἤρπασε Νύμφη
 ἐξ ὄρεος, καὶ νῦν ἱερὸς Ἀστακίδης.
 οὐκέτι Δικταίησιν ὑπὸ δρυσίν, οὐκέτι Δάφνιν,
 ποιμένες, Ἀστακίδην δ' αἰὲν ἀεισόμεθα.

(Call. *AP* 7.518 = *HE* 36)

A nymph seized the goatherd Astacides of Crete
 from the mountain, and now Astacides is blest.
 No more, no more 'of Daphnis' shall we shepherds sing
 under the oaks of Dicte, but always 'of Astacides'.³⁵

Here a bucolic atmosphere is created by a number of elements, all indicated briefly: the fact that Astacides is a goatherd, his abduction by a nymph (which implies an erotic element), the singing (which is about Astacides instead of some well-known bucolic character like Daphnis), and the rural setting under the oak trees of Mount Dicte. In Callimachus, this is the only example of bucolic epigram, but there are many more dating from the third century BCE, particularly in the work of Theocritus (*AP* 6.177 = *HE* 6 and *HE* 19–22), Anyte (*AP* 291 = *HE* 3), and Leonidas of Tarentum (*AP* 7.657 = *HE* 19), and then again in later times. Formally these epigrams are sometimes, but not always, shaped as dedicatory ones—as is Theocritus *AP* 6.177, where Daphnis dedicates some rustic possessions to Pan—or as funeral ones in a bucolic setting. Thus we find a number of epigrams about dead shepherds, such as Callimachus *AP* 7.518,³⁶ and one about a dead little goat, namely Theocritus *AP* 9.432 = *HE* 22.³⁷ A link with Theocritus' *Idylls* may be detected at various levels. In Theocritus *AP* 6.177 we may see close connections with Theocritus' *Idyll* 1,³⁸ so that the epigram may well be read as a miniature inspired by that poem; and *AP* 9.432 may be connected with *Idyll* 4 in a similar way.³⁹ Theocritus *HE* 19–21 (= *AP* 9.338, 9.437, and 9.433), also placed in a bucolic

³⁴ On bucolic epigram, see in general L. Rossi (2001), 29–73; Stanzel (2007), 333–51.

³⁵ Translations of Callimachus are from Nisetich (2001), slightly modified.

³⁶ The possibility that this epigram is part of a literary discourse and that Astacides stands for a poet is discussed by Gow and Page (1965), 2: 193–4.

³⁷ This is an early example of the subgenre of epitaphs for animals, which later became very popular; see L. Rossi (2001), 179–84 and n. 31 in this chapter.

³⁸ See L. Rossi (2001), 131–9, who also allows for the possibility that the epigram was composed by an imitator of Theocritus.

³⁹ See L. Rossi (2001), 184–6.

background, cannot be classified under the headings of funeral or dedicatory epigram but, as monologues addressed to a 'you', they show a mimetic presentation that in narrative technique relates them even more closely to the *Idylls*.⁴⁰

In later generations of epigrammatists we find more examples of epigrams set in a bucolic sphere: dedicatory epigrams (e.g. Adaeus *AP* 6.258 = *GPh* 2, Antiphilus *AP* 6.95 = *GPh* 15, Erycius *AP* 6.255 = *GPh* 5, Philip *AP* 6.99 = *GPh* 15) and epigrams about the death or tomb of shepherds (e.g. Antiphilus *AP* 7.622 = *GPh* 18, Erycius *AP* 7.174 = *GPh* 7), but also ecphrastic ones (e.g. Alcaeus of Messene *AP* 226 = *HE* 20 about Pan and dancing nymphs), epigrams about Daphnis (e.g. Meleager *AP* 7.535 = *HE* 126, Zonas *AP* 9.556 = *GPh* 8), or little animal scenes (e.g. Adaeus *AP* 6.228 = *GPh* 1 about a retired ox, Erycius *AP* 9.558 = *GPh* 3 about dogs protecting goats from a wolf). This subgenre clearly enjoyed an ongoing popularity and lent itself to a considerable amount of variation.

3.3. The Paraklausithyron and Erotic Epigram

Among the sympotic and erotic epigrams there are a few interesting examples of miniaturization of the paraklausithyron by the poets of the third century BCE. Here the generic background may be found in archaic lyric poetry (e.g. Alc. fr. 374 V) as well as in comedy, and so, as in the epigrams related to narrative elegy, we may see multiple influences.⁴¹ There are a few Callimachean instances. In Callimachus *AP* 5.23 = *HE* 63 we have a small-scale paraklausithyron by a lover left outside Conopion's house⁴² and in Callimachus *AP* 12.118 = *HE* 8 we find a brief (letter of?) apology to Archinus, whose house the writer has visited urged by wine and love. We also have clear examples of miniature paraklausithyra in the form of brief dramatic monologues delivered at the threshold of a beloved's house in Asclepiades *HE* 11–14 (= *AP* 5.64, 5.145, 5.164, and 5.167) and *AP* 5.189 = *HE* 42⁴³ and Posidippus *AP* 5.213:

Πυθιάς εἰ μὲν ἔχει τιν', ἀπέρχομαι· εἰ δὲ καθεύδει
 ὦδε μόνη, μικρὸν πρὸς Διὸς εἰσκαλέσαι.
 εἰπὲ δὲ σημείων, μεθύων ὅτι καὶ διὰ κλωπῶν
 ῥῆθον ἔρωτι θρασεῖ χρώμενος ἡγεμόνι.
 (Posidipp. *AP* 5.213 = *HE* 4 = 130 A–B)

⁴⁰ On these epigrams, see L. Rossi (2001), 141–77.

⁴¹ See Sens (2011), 68 (with further references).

⁴² The poem was, however, regarded as not Callimachean by Pfeiffer (1949–53), 2: 99, who was followed with some hesitation by Gow and Page (1965), 2: 214–15.

⁴³ This poem may, though, be by another poet and not by Asclepiades; see Sens (2011), 286.

If Pythias has another, I am off. But if she sleeps
 alone, let her by Zeus invite me in for a while.
 Give her as a sign, that drunk and through thieves
 I have come with daring Love as my guide.

From a similar context is perhaps Asclepiades *AP* 12.153 = *HE* 19, where a girl complains that her beloved Archeades is no longer paying attention or coming to her. Here Gow and Page regard the presentation of the situation from the girl's point of view as unusual in epigram,⁴⁴ but it does fit in with a more general tendency to give women in love a voice in Hellenistic poetry. Moreover, one could consider the epigram as a miniature comparable to Theocritus' *Idyll* 2, a (much longer) urban mime about Simaetha, a girl in a very similar situation who complains about the lover who deserted her and tries to win him back.⁴⁵ In later epigrammatists we find the paraklausithyron motif for instance in Meleager (*AP* 5.191 = *HE* 73, *AP* 12.23 = *HE* 99, and *AP* 12.167 = *HE* 109).⁴⁶

Apart from the paraklausithyron, we may also observe a tendency among epigrammatists of around 200 BCE to write epigrams that are sexually more outspoken and often inspired by the grim and realistic view of love dominant in archaic love poetry rather than by the more refined and playful symposium setting of some of the epigrams by Asclepiades and Callimachus.⁴⁷ An early indication of this trend may already be found in the way in which Nossis relates herself to Sappho,⁴⁸ but only in later epigrammatists do we find poems that may be read as miniatures of earlier archaic lyric works and show the grim view of love and life and the sexual outspokenness known from archaic poetry—particularly (though not exclusively) from poets like Hipponax and Archilochus. Thus Alcaeus of Messene *AP* 5.10 = *HE* 6 is a monologue by an unhappy lover that opens with the words ἐχθαίρω τὸν Ἔρωτα ('I hate Eros'), which recall passages such as Anacreon *PMG* 413, about Eros as a cruel blacksmith, or Ibycus *PMG* 286, about Eros as a fiery Thracian storm. In Dioscorides' epigrams we see a similar engagement with archaic poetry. Dioscorides *AP* 5.55 is a monologue describing a sexual encounter and recalls at several points Archilochus' fragment 196a W, particularly the part where the narrator is having sex with the girl whom he desires:

⁴⁴ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 129.

⁴⁵ For further evidence, see Sens (2011), 125–6, who also suggests that the roots of the idea of women complaining about their male lovers may be found in the Theognidean corpus. From another point of view, the epigram may foreshadow the later development of epigrams with brief speeches of mythological or other characters in given situations (the so-called *ethopoia*); for a survey and examples of such epigrams, see Amato and Ventrella (2005).

⁴⁶ See also Tarán (1979), 52–114.

⁴⁷ For further discussion of the love poetry of epigrammatists of the late third–early second century BCE, see Harder (forthcoming).

⁴⁸ Cf. Noss. *AP* 7.718 = *HE* 11 and the discussion of this epigram in Gutzwiller (1998), 85–7.

Δωρίδα τὴν ῥοδόπυγον ὑπὲρ λεχέων διατείνας
 ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς ἀθάνατος γέγονα.
 ἣ γὰρ ὑπερφυέεσσι μέσον διαβάσά με ποσσὶν
 ἥνυσεν ἀκλινέως τὸν Κύπριδος δόλιχον,
 ὄμμασι νωθρὰ βλέπουσα· τὰ δ', ἥύτε πνεύματι φύλλα,
 ἀμφισαλευομένης ἔτρεμε πορφύρεα,
 μέχρ' ἄπεσπείσθη λευκὸν μένος ἀμφοτέροισιν,
 καὶ Δωρὶς παρέτοις ἐξεχύθη μέλεσι.
 (Diosc. AP 5.55 = HE 5)

Keeping rosy-rumped Doris stretched out above my bed
 in pale-green flowers I have become immortal.
 For she, bestriding me with her enormous legs,
 completed without swerving the long run of Cypris,
 looking at me with indolent eyes; and these, like leaves in a breeze,
 quivered brightly as she was tossing about,
 until the white force was spent for both of us,
 and Doris lay spread out with relaxed limbs.⁴⁹

Here the prepositional phrase ἄνθεσιν ἐν (v. 2) recalls Archilochus' fragment 196a.42 W ἐν ἄνθε[σιν] ('among the flowers') and λευκὸν μένος (v. 7) echoes Archilochus' fragment 196a.52 W λευκ]ὸν μένος ('white force'). The poem may be read as a miniature version of this or similar poems by the earlier poet.⁵⁰

3.4. The Propempticon

Another possible example of miniaturization is the propempticon: sometimes we find elements of the propempticon in erotic epigrams or in epigrams about omens, and in a few cases we have examples of 'real' miniatures in the genre. The propempticon sung by Lycidas in Theocritus' *Idyll* 7.52–89 provides a good example of the kind of poem of which epigrams could form miniature versions, and we also have some remains of earlier propemptica, for example in Sappho's fragment 5 V (asking for a safe journey for her brother)⁵¹ and in Solon's fragment 19 W (a self-propempticon).⁵² We may find some elements of this genre in Posidippus 21 and 22 A–B, two of the poems included in his *Oionoskopika*: in the opening lines of 21 A–B, the imperative addressed to a hawk to appear as a good omen hints at the conditions for a good journey

⁴⁹ My translation.

⁵⁰ On the allusions in this poem, see Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007), 450–1; for further discussion and references, see Schrier (1979; 1982); Harder (forthcoming).

⁵¹ For further references and literature, see Hunter (1999) on Theoc. *Id.* 7.52–89. On connections between Posidippus and Theocritus' *Idylls*, see also Raimondi (2005), 133–46, particularly in relation to Posidipp. 19 A–B.

⁵² See n. 3 in this chapter and generally F. Cairns (1972).

(apparently achieved for the addressee Timon, as is indicated in the last verse), and in 22 A–B, an undefined ‘we’ hopes for the guidance of the Thracian crane as a good omen when crossing the Egyptian sea.⁵³ In Callimachus *AP* 13.10 = *HE* 69, which is a prayer concerning a ship that has carried off the speaker’s beloved, we may have part of an epigram shaped as a propempticon, written in an Asclepiadeus maior, although Gow and Page are somewhat doubtful and state that, although an epigram could serve the purpose of a propempticon ‘the scale of the lines suggests a longer poem’.⁵⁴ In later epigrams we find a good example of a propempticon, with erotic motivation and an urgent appeal to Zephyr, in Dioscorides’ surviving oeuvre:

τὸν καλὸν ὥς ἔλαβες κομίσας πάλι πρὸς με θεωρὸν
 Εὐφραγόρην, ἀνέμων πρηνύτατε Ζέφυρε,
 εἰς ὀλίγον ἴτινας† μηνῶν μέτρον ὥς καὶ ὁ μικρὸς
 μυριέτης κέκριται τῷ φιλέοντι χρόνος.
 (Diosc. *AP* 12.171 = *HE* 11)

May you bring back to me, as you took him to go to a festival,
 the beautiful Euphragoras, Zephyr, gentlest of the winds,
 allowing a small number of months for the journey, for a brief
 time seems to be an eternity for a lover.⁵⁵

In addition, there is an interesting case of variation, also with an erotic twist, in Meleager *AP* 12.52 = *HE* 81, where the speaker wishes that he were a dolphin carrying his beloved to Rhodes. Besides, there are quite a number of epigrams with prayers for a good journey spoken by the travellers themselves, not by people sending others on their way, in other words self-propemptica, for example Posidippus 22 A–B, Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 10.25 = *GPh* 40, Antiphilus *AP* 10.17 = *GPh* 11, Crinagoras *AP* 10.24 = *GPh* 34, and Philodemus *AP* 6.251 = *GPh* 7.⁵⁶

4. MINIATURE DIDACTIC IN EPIGRAM?

Although didactic epic forms part of the epic tradition, the works in this genre are generally only a fraction of the length of the vast narrative of Homeric epics and one may raise the question whether they, too, lend themselves to

⁵³ On possibly programmatic overtones in relation to Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.13–14 Pf., see Lelli (2005), 112–13.

⁵⁴ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 218.

⁵⁵ My translation.

⁵⁶ Sometimes we also find other variations on the idea of travelling—as in Antip. Sid. *AP* 10.2 = *HE* 41 and Marc. Arg. *AP* 10.4 = *GPh* 28, about spring as the right time for sailing, or in Crin. *AP* 9.559 = *GPh* 32, which makes a request for a guidebook on the route to be taken (on Crinagoras’ epigram, see Campbell’s chapter in this volume).

miniaturization in epigram, like the other (admittedly much shorter) genres discussed in this chapter. In the third century BCE Hesiod was an important model for Callimachus' *Aetia*,⁵⁷ and Hesiod and, to a lesser extent, Aratus are sometimes referred to explicitly in epigram. Thus we find Hesiod and Aratus in Callimachus *AP* 9.507 = *HE* 56, where the two are praised and Aratus is described as a worthy successor of Hesiod.⁵⁸ Other, somewhat later poets of the third century BCE show similar signs of appreciation for Hesiod; so do Mnaseas in *AP* 7.54 = *HE* 18 and particularly Alcaeus of Messene in *AP* 7.55 = *HE* 12, where nymphs wash Hesiod's corpse and goatherds honour him with drops of milk and honey, as a poet who 'had tasted of the pure drops of the nine Muses', that is, a poet who had written refined poetry with the help of the Muses (*ἐννέα Μουσέων . . . καθαρῶν γευσάμενος λιβάδων*, vv. 5–6).⁵⁹ Later we see poets giving an erotic twist to their use of Hesiod and indicating that they prefer beautiful boys or girls to his didactic epic, as in Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 11.24 = *GPh* 3 (about a beautiful cup-bearer called Helicon) and in Marcus Argentarius *AP* 9.161 = *GPh* 15 (where the beautiful Pyrrha is preferred to reading Hesiod).

Perhaps one may also detect further evidence of the reception of didactic epic in epigrams with no explicit mention of its main representatives but with a kind of miniaturization comparable to that described in the preceding sections. If one looks at the epigrams presented as the *Oionoskopika* (Posidippus 21–35 A–B), one can easily imagine some kind of prose handbook as a source for these poems, just as may have existed for works of didactic poetry like Nicander's *Alexipharmaca* and *Theriaca* or Aratus' *Phaenomena*; and in fact, read as a group, these epigrams may convey the impression of a similar kind of didactic work on omens, though of course on a smaller, or rather a miniature, scale. In particular, the fact that a considerable number of epigrams in this group are on bird omens (21–4, 26–7, 29, 31, and 35 A–B) may relate it to works such as Callimachus' treatise on birds (frs 414–28 Pf.), which also contained remarks on omens (as in fr. 428 Pf.). In a similar way, one may relate the epigrams on precious stones in Posidippus 1–20 A–B to didactic works in prose or poetry belonging to the *Lithika* tradition, such as Theophrastus' *De lapidibus* (*On Stones*), or the much later Orphic *Lithika*.⁶⁰

In later epigrammatists we find nothing quite similar, but perhaps Dioscorides *HE* 20–4 (= *AP* 7.410, 7.411, 7.37, 7.707, and 7.708) may be read as a series

⁵⁷ See e.g. Harder (2012), 1: 27–30.

⁵⁸ The Heliconian scene in Asclep. *AP* 9.64 = *HE* 45, which recalls the beginning of Hesiod's *Theogony* and his meeting with the Muses, is also of interest but, as Gow and Page (1965), 2: 149 and Sens (2011), 309–10 argue, this epigram may have been composed by Archias rather than by Asclepiades. For Aratus, cf. also Leon. *AP* 9.25 = *HE* 101.

⁵⁹ These last words may be intended to connect him with Callimachus' poetics as expressed in *Ap.* 110–12 Pf.

⁶⁰ On this kind of texts, see further Hünemörder (1999), 353–4.

of epigrams representing a history of Greek drama in which he could have been inspired by the antiquarian prose works of an author like Philochorus.⁶¹ The lack of further examples may partly be due to the fact that of these later poets we have no 'poetry books' like that of Posidippus. There are, however, a few epigrams such as Adaeus *AP* 10.20 = *GPh* 10 and Dioscorides *AP* 5.54 = *HE* 7 that remind one of later works with erotic advice such as Ovid's *Ars amatoria* and could conceivably reflect the existence of similar works in Greek, which do not survive.⁶² Although the evidence is scanty, one gets the impression that didactic epic could have been more prone than heroic narrative epic to the kind of miniaturization of which we have seen some examples in this chapter, possibly because of its rather strong catalogue character, which helped to divide it into shorter coherent sections that could be isolated and reworked as 'miniatures'.⁶³

5. CONCLUSIONS

To summarize, it seems that shorter poetic genres of Greek poetry, and perhaps also didactic poetry, lent themselves well to a kind of miniaturization in epigram, and increasingly so as time went on—just like drama and comedy, from which one could isolate short scenes.

At first the poets often remained within the framework of the more established subgroups of epigrams and adhered to settings that recalled the old categories of funeral, dedicatory, or ephrastic inscriptions—but also, intriguingly, the new subgenre of erotic and sympotic epigram, which, although not related to the old conventions of inscriptions, apparently was well established at an early stage. Thus the widening of thematic scope and the experiments with the content of other genres were, as it were, eased by a certain conservatism of adhering to older frameworks. Even so, there are also indications that boundaries could be crossed and new contents and themes could be

⁶¹ On Philochorus, who wrote on various subjects related to the tragic poets, see Meister (2000), 821–2.

⁶² As has been argued, erotic manuals such as the one attributed to Philaenis may have been the source for Ovid's *Ars amatoria* (see e.g. Gibson 2003, 14–19) and, in addition, of 'didactic' erotic epigrams, as Maria Kanellou suggests to me.

⁶³ A somewhat different, but perhaps comparable example of the 'miniaturization' of a historical prose work in elegiac poetry may be found at Call. *Aet. fr.* 75.54–77 Pf., where Callimachus summarizes the Cean history of Xenomedes and turns it into elegiacs. This suggests that the concept of creating poetic miniature versions of larger scholarly works existed also in other genres. In addition, Antiphan. *GPh* 6–8 (= *AP* 9.409, 10.100, and 11.168)—which preaches about (a) a man who does not enjoy the pleasures of life, (b) the shortness of life and the need to make the most of it, and (c) the futility of saving up instead of enjoying life—may perhaps reflect a longer treatise of a moralistic character. But this interpretation is not cogent.

explored. So, whereas later epigrammatists seem to allow generic and thematic variation in much more obvious and explicit ways, the poets of the first half of the third century BCE already display the possibility of this kind of development and by their careful and still fairly isolated experiments seem to sow its seeds, but they clearly stand at its beginning. In many cases we see that, after the first experiments of this kind were undertaken by the generation of Callimachus, later poets further explored the possibilities of 'miniaturization' and amalgamation of basic features of other genres and became more and more bold and creative in their attempts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the editors of this volume, particularly Maria Kanellou and Chris Carey, for their constructive comments and suggestions on this chapter.

Variations on Simplicity

Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum
in Philip's *Garland*

Charles S. Campbell

1. INTRODUCTION

Philip of Thessalonica conceived of his mid-first-century anthology of epigrams, the *Garland*, as a sequel to the identically titled collection by Meleager of approximately a century and a half earlier: ἀνθεά σοι . . . ἀντανέπλεξα τοῖς Μελεαγρείοις ὥς ἔκελον στεφάνοις ('I have woven blossoms for you, like the Meleagrean garlands', *AP* 4.2.1–4 = *GPh* 1.1–4).¹ Modern studies, however, considering the relationship between the two anthologies, have emphasized substantive rupture and an anaemic, purely stylistic imitation of the earlier tradition. Pierre Laurens, for instance, though acknowledging some continuity between the two *Garlands*, remarks on the lower quality, the paucity of erotic epigram, and the new—Roman (and generally Italian)—milieu of Philip's collection, evoked most clearly in the large number of 'occasional poems' (*Zeitgedichte*) addressed to prominent Romans.² Meanwhile, the most evident continuities between the Meleagrean and the Philippan epigrammatists have been written off as being the result of slavish stylistic imitation of the former by the latter. In the view of Gow and Page, for instance, the primary debt of the Philippan epigrammatists to their predecessors lies in the unfortunate

¹ Texts of the epigrams are reproduced from Gow and Page (1965; 1968). Translations are my own.

² Laurens (1965), 317–22. Cf. Gow and Page (1968), 1: xxxiii–xxxvi. Similar, though less negative, is Magnelli (2007), 175–9. On the Roman milieu of Philip's *Garland*, see also the catalogue in Gow and Page (1968), 1: xxxii–xxxiii. Modern scholarly assessment of Philip's collection is discussed by Höschel elsewhere in this volume.

predilection of some of them for the ornate and, at least in Gow's opinion, vapid style of the early third-century epigrammatist Leonidas of Tarentum.³

While Philip's own editorial techniques are subjected to a much needed reappraisal by Regina Höschele elsewhere in this volume, this chapter focuses on the poets of Philip's *Garland* themselves and their relationship both to their Meleagrean predecessors and to one another. Case studies drawn from Philodemus, Crinagoras, and Antipater of Thessalonica, members of roughly successive generations active in Italy in the first centuries BCE/CE, will illustrate their complex debt, both formal and thematic, to two key early Hellenistic models: Callimachus and Leonidas. In line with recent studies drawing attention to the literary dimensions of putatively subliterate categories, such as 'imitation and variation' and 'occasional poetry',⁴ I shall show that strategies of formal imitation, down to the level of the individual letter or phoneme, map onto a larger conceptual reworking of ethical content. Callimachus and Leonidas, I argue, offered the poets of Philip's anthology not just templates for formal imitation, but also models of poetic personae whose poetic and ethical outlooks served by turns as positive or negative models for the later epigrammatists' authorial self-representations.

2. POETICS AND ETHICS IN CALLIMACHUS AND LEONIDAS

Given that there is no space here for a detailed survey of poetic and ethical themes in Callimachus and Leonidas, I must confine myself to a broad sketch, highlighting features particularly important for the subsequent analysis of the Philippan epigrammatists. Namely, both poets espouse 'smallness' and 'humbleness' (emblemized above all by the word *λιτός*) as principles of poetics and ethics. These ideas and the distinctive expression given to them by Callimachus

³ For Leonidas' status as 'the most imitated of all Hellenistic epigrammatists', see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 307. Cf. the passages cited by Geffcken (1896), 146–9. On the 'Leonideans' as a group in Philip's *Garland*, see Gow and Page (1968), 1: xxxiv–xxxv. Gow's disdain for Leonidas is colourfully expressed at Gow (1958), 117. For a counterpoint, see Gutzwiller (1998), 114, who suggests that later poets may have been attracted to the themes as well as to the form of Leonidas' poetry.

⁴ By 'formal' imitation and variation I mean a manipulation, sometimes seemingly mechanical and verging on mere *metathesis*, of a given model at the level of diction and grammatical construction, which leaves the thematic framework substantially intact. On the literary dimensions of this kind of formal imitation and variation, see Sens (2007). On 'occasional poetry', see Fowler (1995), who argues for a more literarily oriented reading of Martial's epigrams originally included in occasional *libelli*. His general observations may be profitably applied to Philip's *Garland* too. Along the same lines, see Whitmarsh (2013), 137–53, who draws attention to subtle literary dimensions of representations of social relations in Philip's *Garland*.

and Leonidas, I shall suggest, offered their Philippan successors an ethical basis on which to appeal to the Roman audience invoked in their poems.⁵

That Callimachus advocated distinctive standards of poetic style and subject matter, prioritizing the small over the large and the slender over the fat, and that these went on to be hugely influential later in antiquity, hardly requires any detailed demonstration here.⁶ It will suffice to mention a couple of famous metapoetic images of importance for the remainder of the chapter. Callimachus' preference for the small and pure is illustrated through the symbol of wine and water drinking in his account, in the *Aetia*, of his meeting at a symposium with a guest from Ikos who, like him, enjoys a 'small cup' of wine (ὀλίγω δ' ἤδετο κισσυβίω, *Aet.* fr. 178.12 Pf.). This symbolism is picked up at the end of the *Hymn to Apollo* (vv. 108–12), in which the poet compares the turbid flow of the 'Assyrian river' with the 'pure drops' of water carried to Demeter by her bees.⁷ This poetic preference for the small over the large, moreover, maps onto the ethics and lifestyle of Callimachus' poetic persona and the characters in his poems. Annemarie Ambühl has argued that Callimachus' depictions of poor, humble figures, such as Molorchus in the *Aetia* and Hecale in the *Hecale*,⁸ function as metapoetic representations of Callimachean aesthetic principles.⁹ In the epigrams, meanwhile, Callimachus correlates a certain brand of principled poetics with a similarly principled lifestyle. He foregoes riches in pursuit of higher aims. To the stranger from Atarneus (*AP* 7.89 = *HE* 54), who enquires whether he should pursue a marriage with a woman above him in social standing and wealth or with another, equal to him, Pittacus replies, 'stick to your own path' (τὴν κατὰ στυγὸν ἔλα, v. 12), in other words marry the woman of your own standing. As Kathryn Gutzwiller has argued, Pittacus' lifestyle advice is also an expression of Callimachus' poetic programme—principled, restrained, and, I would add, scornful of material rewards—which is expressed elsewhere in the epigrams.¹⁰ The same nexus of humble lifestyle and poetic style, and the antagonism between wealth and virtue, recurs in the *Iambi*. In *Iambus* 3, according to

⁵ This 'ethic of simplicity' rebuts the notion that luxury from the (Greek) East was corrupting traditional Roman values, which is so common in Latin literature of the second and first centuries BCE. See Henrichs (1995) for an overview of this vast topic. For Greeks as exemplars of an upstanding simple life in Latin literature, see Vergil's depiction of Evander's Pallanteum in *Aen.* 8 (esp. vv. 359–69), with the interpretation of Papaioannou (2003). Leonidas, moreover, himself a Greek native of Italy, offered a natural point of reference for Greek poets as they appealed to a Roman audience.

⁶ The bibliography is immense. For the influence of the *Aetia* prologue, see Harder (2012), 2: 9–10; more generally, De Stefani and Magnelli (2011); also Barchiesi (2011), who points to Callimachus as a model for Latin authors both in defining the relationship between poetry, politics, and power and in navigating patronage relationships—all issues salient for this chapter.

⁷ On the metapoetic imagery of wine and water in Callimachus, see Knox (1985).

⁸ See pp. 113–14 in this volume.

⁹ Ambühl (2004), esp. 40–1, with additional bibliography at 36 n. 68.

¹⁰ Gutzwiller (1998), 226, with additional bibliography.

the *Diegesis*, the poet complains that boys give favours to lovers because of their wealth rather than for their virtue.¹¹ In *Iambus* 12, Apollo claims that his gift of a hymn for the newborn Hebe is superior to any gift made of gold, creating an antithesis, as Benjamin Acosta-Hughes notes, between ‘the eternal life of song and the ephemeral, often sinful, acquisition of gold’.¹²

Like Callimachus, Leonidas emerges in his epigrams as a vivid authorial presence, with a carefully drawn persona whose circumstances and experiences—poverty, illness, and a life of wandering—mirror those of the humble characters who populate his epigrams and whose ethical pronouncements exalt his and their simple lives.¹³ Leonidas’ depiction of humble characters (the poor and the elderly), his representation of his own principled and humble lifestyle, his ethics, and his statements of poetic preferences are all connected by a diction and imagery of ‘smallness’ forming a unified ethical-poetic outlook that parallels that of Callimachus.¹⁴

These features of Leonidas’ poetry are crystallized in two epigrams (AP 6.300 and 6.302) transmitted to us in a sequence from Meleager’s *Garland* that consists mostly of dedications made by poor individuals (AP 6.288–303), a section of which (AP 6.300–3) merits quoting in full, as it offers a fascinating case study for the history of the reception of both Leonidas and Callimachus:

Λαθρία, ἐκ ἱπλάνης† ταύτην χάριν ἔκ τε πενέστω
 κῆξ ὀλιγσιπύου δέξο Λεωνίδεω
 ψαιστά τε πύηντα καὶ εὐθήσαυρον ἐλαίην
 καὶ τοῦτο χλωρὸν σῦκον ἀποκράδιον
 κευόινου σταφυλῆς ἔχ’ ἀποσπάδα πεντάρρωνον,
 πότνια, καὶ σπονδὴν τήνδ’ ὑποπυμίδιον.
 ἦν δέ με χῶς ἐκ νούσου ἀνερύσω, ὦδε καὶ ἐχθρῆς
 ἐκ πενίης ῥύσῃ, δέξο χιμαιροθύτην.
 (Leon. AP 6.300 = HE 36)

5

Lathria, accept this offering from the wanderer (?), the impoverished,
 the man of the small meal-tub, Leonidas:
 rich cakes and long-stored olive oil,
 and this green fig fresh from the branch
 and this bunch of five grapes from the vine good for wine,
 O goddess, and this libation from the bottom of the jar.
 If, as you saved me from hateful illness, you also save me from
 poverty, then receive (me as) a goat-sacrificer.

¹¹ On this poem and the themes of wealth, poverty, and virtue in Callimachus’ *Iambi* and the archaic iambic tradition in general, see Acosta-Hughes (2002), 205–51.

¹² Ibid., 125.

¹³ Gutzwiller (1998), 113–14.

¹⁴ Connections between the two poets are explored by Piacenza (2010).

τὴν ἀλίην Εὐδημος, ἐφ' ἧς ἅλα λιτὸν ἐπέσθων
 χεϊμῶνας μεγάλους ἐξέφυγεν δανέων,
 θῆκε θεοῖς Σαμόθραξι, λέγων ὅτι τήνδε κατ' εὐχὴν,
 ὦ λαοί, σωθεῖς ἐξ ἁλὸς ὧδε θέτο.

(Call. AP 6.301 = HE 28)

The saltbox, aboard which—eating his humble salt—
 he escaped great storms of debts,
 Eudemos dedicated to the Samothracian gods, saying that in accordance
 with his vow,
 O people, having been saved from the salt he placed it here.

φεύγεθ' ὑπέκ καλύβης, σκότιοι μύες· οὔτι πενιχρὴ
 μῦς σιπύη βόσκειν οἶδε Λεωνίδεω.
 αὐτάρκης ὁ πρέσβυς ἔχων ἅλα καὶ δύο κρίμνα·
 ἐκ πατέρων ταύτην ἠνέσαμεν βιοτήν.
 τῷ τί μεταλλεύεις τοῦτον μυχόν, ὦ φιλόλιχνε,
 οὐδ' ἀποδειπνιδίου γενομένου σκυβάλου;
 σπεύδων εἰς ἄλλους οἴκους ἴθι—τάμὰ δὲ λιτά—
 ὦν ἄπο πλειοτέρην οἴσεται ἀρμαλὴν.

5

(Leon. AP 6.302 = HE 37)

Get out of my hut you furtive mice! The poor meal-tub
 of Leonidas knows not how to feed mice.
 An old man is self-sufficient with salt and two biscuits:
 this lifestyle we have adopted from our ancestors.
 Why do you mine this corner, O glutton,
 though you taste not even a scrap of dinner leftovers?
 Hurry off to other houses—my means are slight—
 from which you will get a richer store.

ὦ μύες, εἰ μὲν ἐπ' ἄρτον ἐληλύθατ', ἐς μυχόν ἄλλον
 στείχετ'—ἐπεὶ λιτὴν οἰκέομεν καλύβην—
 οὐ καὶ πίονα τυρὸν ἀποδρέψεσθε καὶ αὐγὴν
 ἰσχάδα καὶ δεῖπνον συχνὸν ἀπὸ σκυβάλων·
 εἰ δ' ἐν ἐμαῖς βύβλοισι πάλιν καταθήξετ' ὀδόντα
 κλαύσεσθ', οὐκ ἀγαθὸν κῶμον ἐπερχόμενοι.

5

(Ariston AP 6.303 = HE 3)

O mice, if you have come for bread, head to another house,
 for I inhabit a humble hut.
 There, you will get rich cheese and a dry fig
 and a great feast of leftovers.
 If, on the other hand, you sharpen your tooth on my books again,
 you will lament that you have come to no fine banquet.

Before we consider the afterlife of these poems in Meleager's and Philip's anthologies, a few words about the two Leonidean epigrams are necessary. In AP 6.300, the poet dedicates an assortment of foods, namely cakes, oil, a

fig. and grapes, to the goddess Lathria (whom Gow and Page identify with Aphrodite)¹⁵ in thanksgiving for rescuing him from an illness, and promises to offer her a goat in the future if she also rescues him from his poverty. In *AP* 6.302, the poet addresses some mice raiding his meal-tub. Here Leonidas upholds poverty as a principled lifestyle inherited from his ancestors (v. 4) and suggests that the mice would be better off stealing food from a richer man.

Gutzwiller has argued that these poems originally introduced an authorially arranged collection of Leonidas' epigrams and that the offerings in *AP* 6.300 form a programmatic metaphor for the 'richness, choiceness, and freshness' of the contents of his epigram book.¹⁶ This programmatic function accords well with the numerous parallels between the portraiture of the poet in these poems and the vignettes of the lives of the humble subjects in his epigrams.¹⁷ In this way Leonidas' self-representation emblemizes the contents of the book as a whole.¹⁸ The ethical standpoint Leonidas enunciates in *AP* 6.302 is also representative of the outlook expressed elsewhere in the corpus. For instance, the praise of the simple life grounded in ancestral custom (ἐκ πατέρων ταύτην ἡνέσαμεν βιοτήν, v. 4) closely parallels the poet's exhortation to the reader in *AP* 7.472.14 = *HE* 77.14 to find satisfaction in a humble lifestyle (εἷης ἐν λιτῇ κεκλιμένος βιοτῇ) and is diametrically opposed to the gluttonous life led by the wicked (κακός) Dorieus (*AP* 6.305 = *HE* 56).

3. RECEPTION OF CALLIMACHUS AND LEONIDAS IN THE TWO GARLANDS

Let us now consider *AP* 6.300–3 as a Meleagrean sequence. The alternating poems by Leonidas and Callimachus, the third-century 'greats', are followed by an epigram of Ariston (probably late third century BCE) that exhibits an obvious debt to its models. Shared themes and diction unify the sequence, as each poem

¹⁵ Gow and Page (1965), 1: 346 (= 2183 f.).

¹⁶ Gutzwiller (1998), 109. Expanding on this suggestion, Piacenza (2010), 84–5 has suggested that the food offerings, when taken individually, symbolize specific qualities of the style and content of Leonidas' epigrams.

¹⁷ Compare, for instance, the first and last couplets of *AP* 6.300 with the words uttered by the three sisters at Leon. *AP* 6.288.9–10 = *HE* 41.9–10; or Leonidas' self-representation in *AP* 6.300 and 6.302 with his description of the elderly fisherman, Theris, in *AP* 7.295 = *HE* 20.

¹⁸ On the function of the persona in governing or unifying the contents of the epigram book and on the connection between Leonidas' persona and the humble subjects of his epigrams, see Gutzwiller (1998), 109–14.

deals with the closely linked themes of poverty (πενίη) and simplicity (λιτότης) and uses food as a symbol of social standing and ethical outlook.¹⁹

By placing Callimachus AP 6.301 between Leonidas AP 6.300 and 6.302, Meleager invites us to read Callimachus' epigram as the fusion of the two Leonidean poems. For Callimachus, the motif of the poor man's salt diet (paralleled in AP 6.302) provides the occasion for an elaborate metaphor: the saltbox is imagined as a ship, aboard which the insolvent Eudemus weathered a storm of debts and which he dedicated as a thanks offering to the Cabiri, a motif drawn from AP 6.300. Meanwhile, the juxtaposition of AP 6.302 and 6.303 highlights the relationship between model and imitation. Ariston recapitulates the mice, the hut (καλύβη), and the outraged poet of AP 6.302, using them as a springboard for further elaboration by shifting the focus away from the poet's food to something of even greater value: his books (of poems?). In addition, Meleager's placement of AP 6.300, also spoken by Leonidas *in propria persona*, in close proximity, urges the reader to consider how Ariston adapted not just the literary style but also the persona and ethical outlook of his model. In Meleager's arrangement, the catalogue of richer foods that Ariston tells the mice they can expect at other houses (AP 6.303.3–4) reads as a nice inversion of the catalogue of humble foods presented by Leonidas to the goddess at AP 6.300.3–6.

Having briefly examined the intersections of ethics, poetics, and poetic personae in Callimachus and Leonidas as well as the concrete ways in which Meleager engaged with these features of their work in his *Garland*, we can now turn to Philip's anthology.

3.1. Philodemus

Philodemus is the earliest of the poets known to have been included in Philip's *Garland*. Born at Gadara, he travelled to Athens and finally to Italy, where he was resident at the Bay of Naples and a friend of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus. As an epigrammatist, Philodemus is mostly known for his humorous, self-aware *erotica* in the spirit of Asclepiades, Callimachus, and Meleager.²⁰ Yet in one of his best-known poems he appears not as a lover but as a philosopher and socialite:

αὔριον εἰς λιτὴν σε καλιάδα, φίλτατε Πείσων,
 ἐξ ἐνάτης ἔλκει μουσοφιλῆς ἔταρος
 εἰκάδα δειπνίζων ἐνιαύσιον· εἰ δ' ἀπολείψεις
 οὔθατα καὶ Βρομίου Χιογενῆ πρόποσιν,
 ἀλλ' ἐτάρους ὄφει παναληθέας, ἀλλ' ἐπακούσῃ

5

¹⁹ The sequence thus follows basic Meleagrian principles of arrangement as laid out by A. Cameron (1993), 19–33.

²⁰ Sider (1997), 24–5.

Φαίγκων γαίης πολὺ μελιχρότερα.
 ἦν δέ ποτε στρέψης καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ὄμματα, Πείσων,
 ἄξιμεν ἐκ λιτῆς εἰκάδα πιότερην.
 (Phld. AP 11.44 = GPh 23)²¹

Tomorrow to his humble cottage, O dearest Piso,
 at three o'clock your Muse-loving friend drags you
 to feed you your yearly dinner celebrating the Twentieth. If you miss
 udders and a toast with Chian wine,
 nevertheless you will see true friends and hear
 things much sweeter than the things of the land of the Phaeacians.
 And if you turn your eyes towards us, O Piso,
 we shall celebrate a richer, rather than a humbler, Twentieth.

Philodemus invites Piso to a dinner party in honour of Epicurus, the occasion known as 'the Twentieth'. He bids Piso to forego opulent feasting in favour of true friendship (vv. 3–5). The conversation will outclass even 'the things of the land of the Phaeacians' (vv. 5–6), a reference either to the generous hospitality Odysseus received while on Scheria, or to the pleasure the Phaeacians derived from hearing Odysseus' tales during his stay.²²

Scholarly discussion has focused on this epigram as a Greek forerunner of the genre of 'invitation poems' popular in Latin literature.²³ The fact, though, that Philodemus' epigram seems to be the *only* obvious comparandum in Greek literature before Catullus has caused puzzlement; many scholars have assumed that earlier epigrammatic examples have simply not survived, while others have looked for parallels in Epicurean texts.²⁴ The possibility cannot, of course, be ruled out that Philodemus drew on lost invitation texts, whether epigrammatic or Epicurean. I would suggest another possibility: Philodemus has transformed Leonidas AP 6.302, where the poet shoos mice *away* from his house, into a poetic invitation in which he welcomes a friend *into* his house. Philodemus retains the use of food and a humble dwelling as symbols of an ethical outlook, but he transforms Leonidas' austere autarky into a sociable, Epicurean simplicity.²⁵

²¹ My translation follows the interpretation of Sider (1997), 152–60.

²² Cf. Bettenworth (2012), 5, who suggests that there is an implicit reference in AP 11.44 to the hut of Eumaeus, where Odysseus is received after his arrival from Scheria. As we shall see, Eumaeus' hut is not the only intertextual allusion in Philodemus' epigram.

²³ On this poetic subgenre, see F. Cairns (1972); Edmunds (1982); Marcovich (1982); Gowers (1993), 220–310.

²⁴ See Edmunds (1982), 186–8. Clayman (2007), 515 points to a dinner invitation (*P.Herc.* 1232 fr. 8 col. 1 = test. 16) attributed to Epicurus himself but admits that the two texts do not share any particular similarities. Sider (1997), 153 remarks that, given the importance of the *εἰκάς* and the appearance of another such invitation at Phld. *De pietate* 812–19 Obbink, the poem may belong to an entirely Epicurean tradition. On the relationship between Catullus 13 and Greek epigram, see now Campbell (2017).

²⁵ Leonidas offered a ready model for an Epicurean like Philodemus, since simple food was a popular topic in Epicurean philosophy. Sider (1997), 161 notes Cicero's remark (*Tusc.* 5.89) regarding Epicurus: *nemo de tenui victu plura dixit* ('no one talked more about a meagre diet').

This suggestion is supported by a series of as yet unnoticed parallels.²⁶ There is an obvious semantic and phonetic affinity between Philodemus' *καλιάς* ('cottage') and Leonidas' *καλύβη* ('hut'), as well as a similarity in their placement in the middle of the first line and their construction in a prepositional phrase: *φεύγεθ' ὑπέκ καλύβης*... (AP 6.302.1) ~ *αὔριον εἰς λιτὴν σε καλιάδα*... (AP 11.44.1). The direction of Leonidas' *ὑπέκ* is reversed, *ὑπέκ* becoming *εἰς* (thus prohibition becomes invitation). The reversal of the force and affect of Leonidas' epigram that this switch encapsulates is partly philosophical in motivation: Leonidas' irascibility and isolated autarky are hereby replaced by Philodemus' echt Epicurean conviviality and friendliness.²⁷

There is a similar pattern of echo and inversion in the final couplet of Philodemus' epigram. Philodemus reverses Leonidas' command that the mice go elsewhere (*εἰς ἄλλους οἴκους*, AP 6.302.7), asking that Piso turn his eye 'towards us' (*εἰς ἡμέας*, AP 11.44.7). If Piso does, the *εἰκάς* they celebrate will be richer, *πιότερην* (AP 11.44.8)—a close phonetic echo of Leonidas' *πλειότερην* (AP 6.302.8).

Georg Kaibel pointed out the religious tone of Philodemus' address to Piso, but did not adduce specific models for the phrasing.²⁸ Models may be found in the sequence AP 6.300–3. Leonidas' dedication to the goddess in AP 6.300, for instance, provides a template for Philodemus' address: *ἦν δέ... ἐκ πενίης ῥύση* (AP 6.300.7–8) ~ *ἦν δέ... στρέψης... ἐκ λιτῆς* (AP 11.44.7–8). We can also detect in the same lines echoes of Ariston AP 6.303.5–6. Note the parallel groupings in these couplets of second-person verbs with body parts as direct objects (*καταθήξεται ὀδόντα* ~ *στρέψης ὄμματα*); the use of first-person possessive adjective or pronoun (*ἐμαῖς* ~ *ἡμέας*); and the future indicative verbs at the beginning of the final pentameter (*κλαύσεσθ' ~ ἄξομεν*). Crucially, Ariston also prefigures Philodemus' description of his humble dwelling (*λιτὴν... καλύβην* AP 6.303.2 ~ *λιτὴν... καλιάδα* AP 11.44.1).

If Epicurus provides the philosophical background for Philodemus' *εἰκάς*, I suggest it is Leonidas who furnishes the primary model for the expression of the ethics of simplicity in the genre of epigram. In an impressive display of the art of variation, Philodemus, by drawing upon elements of multiple texts, including epigrams that he found collocated in Meleager's *Garland*, and by conflating some and inverting others, may have invented a new subgenre in Greek and Latin poetry: the 'invitation poem'.

²⁶ For a detailed analysis of formal techniques of variation in epigram similar to those discussed in this chapter, see Ypsilanti (2006).

²⁷ Epicurean autarky did not entail austerity, cf. Epicur. fr. 51 Arrighetti: *ἐξηλώσαμεν τὴν αὐτάρκειαν οὐχ ὅπως τοῖς εὐτελέσι καὶ λιτοῖς πάντως χρώμεθα ἀλλ' ὅπως θαρρῶμεν πρὸς αὐτά* ('We have pursued self-sufficiency not in order to live always in cheap and humble circumstances, but rather in order to bear up against them'). On the adjective *λιτός* as a keyword in Epicurean ethics, see Hiltbrunner (1972), 169.

²⁸ Kaibel (1885), xxiii–xxiv.

3.2. Crinagoras

The next case study I would like to consider is drawn from Philodemus' close successor, Crinagoras. Born in Lesbos, evidently into a family of high status, he was chosen as one of the ambassadors sent to Rome to renegotiate the political status of the island.²⁹ He remained there and was active at the court of Augustus, as we can judge from his poetry, written over the course of a long career beginning probably in the 40s BCE and lasting until at least 11 CE. He extensively thematizes his relationships with high-status Romans, including members of the emperor's family and inner circle, and the Italian environment in which he lived and worked.

Two epigrams of Crinagoras, AP 9.559 and 9.545, illustrate the ways in which he draws upon Callimachean and Leonidean models in crafting his literary persona as a Greek poet in Roman society. In AP 9.559, the poet announces his plans to travel to Italy and asks his friend Menippus, a geographer, to compose a travel guide for him:

πλοῦς μοι ἐπ' Ἰταλίην ἐντύνεται· ἐς γὰρ ἑταίρους
 στέλλομαι, ὧν ἤδη δηρὸν ἄπειμι χρόνον.
 διφέω δ' ἡγητῆρα περίπλοον, ὅς μ' ἐπὶ νήσους
 Κυκλάδας ἀρχαίην τ' ἄξει ἐπὶ Σχερίην.
 σύν τί μοι ἀλλά, Μένιππε, λάβευ φίλος, ἱστορα κύκλον
 γράψας, ὃ πάσης ἔδρι γεωγραφίης.
 (Crin. AP 9.559 = GPh 32)

I am planning a trip to Italy, for I am going to see friends
 from whom I have been away a long time.
 But I am looking for a *periplus* as a guide, to take me to the islands of
 the Cyclades and ancient Scheria.
 Help me out, my dear Menippus, by writing a learned 'Tour',
 O you, knowledgeable in all aspects of geography.

Like many ancient travellers, Crinagoras likens himself to Odysseus by including in his itinerary the island of Scheria, home of the Phaeacians. A precedent in epigram is offered by Leonidas' self-epitaph, AP 7.715:

πολλὸν ἀπ' Ἰταλίας κείμει χθονὸς ἔκ τε Τάραντος
 πάτρης· τοῦτο δέ μοι πικρότερον θανάτου.
 τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος· ἀλλὰ με Μοῦσαι
 ἔστερξαν, λυγρῶν δ' ἀντὶ μελιχρὸν ἔχω.
 οὐνομα δ' οὐκ ἤμυσε Λεωνίδου· αὐτὰ με δῶρα
 κηρύσσει Μουσέων πάντας ἐπ' ἡελίους.
 (Leon. AP 7.715 = HE 93)

²⁹ On Crinagoras' career, see Gow and Page (1968), 2: 210–13.

Far from Italy and from my fatherland of Taras I lie;
 this to me is bitterer than death.
 Such a wandering life is lifeless, but the Muses
 have loved me, and instead of pains I have what is sweet.
 The name of Leonidas has not perished:
 the gifts of the Muses herald me for all time.

The poem contains a web of Homeric allusions. As Gutzwiller has shown, *πολλόν* (v. 1), *πάτρης* (v. 2), and *πλανίων* (v. 3) are a subtle but effective verbal and phonetic reminiscence of the opening of the *Odyssey* (where cf. *πολλά* v. 1, *πλάγχθη* v. 2, *πολλῶν* v. 3, *πολλά* v. 4) and, I would add, of thematically important phrases ubiquitous in the *Odyssey* such as *ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἴης*, ‘away from his fatherland’ (e.g. *Od.* 1.75).³⁰ Meanwhile the references to the Muses (*Μουσέων*) and to the sun (*ἡλείους*) in verse 6 recall the invocation of the Muse (*Μοῦσα*) and the mention of the Sun’s cattle (*Ἡελίοιο*) that frame the proem of the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 1.1 and 1.8 respectively).³¹

Crinagoras’ intricate engagement with this Leonidean epigram in *AP* 9.559 has gone unnoticed. Leonidas, a Greek native of Italy, laments his own absence from his homeland. Crinagoras, by contrast, looks forward to a trip *from* his homeland *to* Italy. In Crinagoras’ epigram, these opposing circumstances are mirrored at the level of formal imitation and variation. The first line neatly reverses the direction of Leonidas’ travels while remaining metrically identical and retaining a close aural and graphic similarity to the first line of Leonidas’ self-epitaph: *πλοῦς μοι ἐπ’ Ἰταλίην* (*AP* 9.559.1) ~ *πολλὸν ἀπ’ Ἰταλίας* (*AP* 7.715.1) and *ἐς γὰρ ἑταίρους* (*AP* 9.559.1) ~ *ἔκ τε Τάραντος* (*AP* 7.715.1). Crinagoras returns to the same Leonidean model at the end of the epigram. Leonidas concludes with a reference to the survival of his poetry for all time: *κηρύσσει Μουσέων πάντας ἐπ’ ἡλείους* (*AP* 7.715.6). Crinagoras, at the end of his poem, refers to Menippus’ knowledge of the whole of geography: *ὦ πάσης ἔδρι γεωγραφίης* (*AP* 9.559.6). The merely formal reminiscence here is faint, but the conceptual variation is interesting: the reference to boundless time in Leonidas becomes a reference to boundless space.³²

Just as Philodemus (*AP* 11.44) reversed the directionality and mood of Leonidas’ address to the mice (*AP* 6.302), here too, complementing the formal variations, there is an inversion of emotional affect. Crinagoras’ journey from Greece to Italy is not framed as a separation from homeland and loved ones but as a journey to visit friends. If he does lament, it is over his long absence from Italy, his *destination*: the expression of (temporal) separation, *δηρὸν ἄπειμι χρόνον* (*AP* 9.559.2), recalls, but inverts the force of, Leonidas’ expression of (spatial) separation, *πολλὸν ἀπ’ Ἰταλίας* (*AP* 7.715.1). Crinagoras’ use

³⁰ Gutzwiller (2012), 105–6.

³¹ Thanks to Maria Kanellou for suggesting this parallel.

³² Thanks to Francesco Pellicio for suggesting this parallel.

of the *Odyssey* likewise runs in a direction opposite to that taken in Leonidas' poem: Leonidas' experiences mirror those of Odysseus, *without* the successful return to Ithaca. Crinagoras looks ahead to the anticipated *completion* of the journey and the joy he will feel at seeing old friends (ἐταίρους, a nice Odyssean touch in v. 1).

This is not an isolated case. Turning to AP 9.545, in which the poet presents a copy of Callimachus' *Hecale* to Marcellus, the nephew of Augustus, we find the beginnings of a pattern in the way Crinagoras handles Leonidean models:

Καλλιμάχου τὸ τορευτὸν ἔπος τόδε· δὴ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ
 ὤνῃρ τοὺς Μουσέων πάντας ἔσεισε κάλως.
 ἀεῖδει δ' Ἑκάλῃς τε φιλοξείνοιο καλιῆν
 καὶ Θησεὶ Μαραθῶν οὓς ἐπέθηκε πόνους·
 τοῦ σοι καὶ νεαρὸν χειρῶν σθένος εἴη ἀρέσθαι,
 Μάρκελλε, κλεινοῦ τ' αἶνον ἕσον βιότου.

5

(Crin. AP 9.545 = *GPh* 11)

This is the chiselled epic of Callimachus: for in it
 the man shook all the sails of the Muses.
 He sings both of the hospitable hut of Hecale
 and the labours which Marathon imposed upon Theseus.
 May it also be granted to you to achieve the youthful strength of his hands,
 Marcellus, and equal praise for a glorious life.

The *Hecale* tells the story of young Theseus' expedition against the Marathonian bull. Caught in a storm along the way, he is offered hospitality by a poor old woman named Hecale, who offers him a simple meal in her humble hut and tells him stories of her past. On the way home, having defeated and captured the bull, he learns that the old woman has died and institutes sacred rites in her honour. Hecale thus becomes a kind of patron saint of travellers.

For the sake of brevity, I must confine myself to one, as yet unremarked, aspect of AP 9.545, namely the way in which subtle echoes of earlier epigrammatists, particularly of Leonidas, intertwine with more overt references to the Callimachean text. As commentators point out, Crinagoras draws upon the *Hecale* for his description of the poem's contents (vv. 3–4). In particular, the *iunctura* φιλοξείνοιο καλιῆν (v. 3) is paralleled in *Hecale* (fr. 263 Hollis), φιλοξείνοιο καλιῆς. For readers of epigram, however, the humble καλιή ('cottage' or 'hut') has a further significance, as it recalls the humble dwellings of Leonidas (AP 6.302) and Philodemus (AP 11.44) that also served as symbols of the ethics of simplicity.³³ Crinagoras' final couplet makes the connection

³³ We might say that the humble dwellings in the 'ethical' epigrams examined here serve a function analogous to that of the lamps in erotic epigram. The humble dwelling is a concrete symbol or anchor for the poet's ethical outlook and role as ethical preceptor. As Kanellou (2013) has shown, in much the same way the motif of the lamp continually renewed by generations of poets serves as a versatile channel for the erotic sensibilities of the epigrammatists.

between the three epigrams clearer. As Isabelle Cogitore observes, Crinagoras gives Marcellus the *Hecale* as a kind of *miroir du prince*, a poem designed to provide models for ethical conduct.³⁴ He should emulate not only Theseus' bravery and might but also his sense of justice, rooted in the respect for the simple life of the poor symbolized by the hut of Hecale.³⁵ Similarly, in *AP* 6.302 and 11.44, the humble dwelling is the symbol of an ethical lifestyle, which means austere autarky in Leonidas, Epicurean simplicity in Philodemus. For Crinagoras as for Philodemus, the humble dwelling serves a specifically protreptic function vis-à-vis his Roman addressee. The exaltation of simple life that runs through all three epigrams corresponds to the formal similarity of the terms used for these humble dwellings: καλύβη, καλιάς, καλή. Crinagoras himself underlines the thematic significance of the term καλή through the repetition of its first syllable in *Καλλιμάχου* (v. 1), *κάλως* (v. 2), *Ἐκάλης* (v. 3), *καλήν* (v. 3); and this repetition of *καλ* is reinforced by the words *Μάρκελλε, κλεινοῦ* (v. 6). The insistent repetition recalls Callimachus' triple repetition of the syllable *άλ-* in *AP* 6.301.³⁶ Perhaps, like Philodemus, Crinagoras too was composing with an eye towards the Meleagrean sequence *AP* 6.300–3 rather than *AP* 6.302 alone.

Crinagoras' poem concludes with a further significant echo of Leonidas: *Μάρκελλε, κλεινοῦ τ' αἶνον ἵσον βιότου* (v. 6). The phrase *αἶνον ἵσον βιότου* signifies how ethical Theseus was and complements his physical might (the *χειρῶν σθένος* in v. 5). It is fitting, then, that the phrase echoes Leonidas' own declaration of ethical principle: *ἐκ πατέρων ταύτην ἡνέσαμεν βιοτήν* (*AP* 6.302.4).

3.3. Antipater of Thessalonica

The final poet whom I would like to consider, Antipater of Thessalonica, was a younger contemporary of Crinagoras and seems to have flourished roughly between 15 BCE and 15 CE. Like Philodemus and Crinagoras, Antipater, too, thematized in his epigrams his experience as a Greek émigré in Roman society.³⁷ In the following case studies I suggest that he adopts a persona and ethics defined in opposition to those of his immediate predecessors, treating Callimachus and Leonidas as *negative* ethical and poetic exempla.

³⁴ Cogitore (2010), 258.

³⁵ The idea that Theseus' justice is rooted in his respect for the poor and humble folk is not explicit in Crinagoras but is evidenced in other ancient testimonia on Callimachus' *Hecale* (see Hollis T10 and T11).

³⁶ This parallel was suggested to me by David Sider.

³⁷ Cf. Antip. Thess. *AP* 9.428 = *GPh* 1 on coming to Rome from Thessalonica; *AP* 11.24 = *GPh* 3 in praise of Italian wine; and Antipater's addresses to his patron Piso in *AP* 9.428 and elsewhere. On his career and relationship to Piso, see Gow and Page (1968), 2: 18–20.

I begin with one of Antipater's best-known epigrams:

φεύγεθ', ὅσοι λόκκας ἢ λοφνίδας ἢ καμασῆνας
 ἄδετε, ποιητῶν φῦλον ἀκανθολόγων,
 οἳ τ' ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες
 κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ.
 σήμερον Ἀρχιλόχοιο καὶ ἄρσενος ἡμαρ Ὀμήρου
 σπένδομεν· ὁ κρητῆρ οὐ δέχεθ' ὕδροπότας.
 (Antip. Thess. AP 11.20 = GPh 20) 5

Away with all of you who sing of 'loccae' [cloaks] or 'lophnides' [torches]
 or 'camasenes' [fish], you race of thorn-gathering poets,
 who trick out the twisted ornament of your verse
 and drink humble water from a sacred spring.
 Today, for the birthday of Archilochus and manly Homer,
 we pour libations: the crater does not receive water-drinkers.

Modern scholarship tends to focus on Antipater's overt invective against Callimachus and his metapoetic use of wine and water drinking.³⁸ As Nicola Piacenza, however, has pointed out, Leonidas is just as much a target of Antipater's invective as Callimachus: the epigram's incipit practically advertizes it as a free reworking of Leonidas AP 6.302 and, on closer examination, several of the anti-Callimachean barbs turn out to have a Leonidean referent as well. The bestial description of the pedantic poets as *φῦλον ἀκανθολόγων* (v. 2), using a term often applied to animals, echoes Callimachus' address to the Telchines in the *Aetia* prologue (*φῦλον ἄ*[, *Aet.* fr. 1.7 Pf.) and at the same time recalls other pests, such as the mice in Leonidas AP 6.302 (and in Ariston AP 6.303, for that matter). Similarly, the *λιτὸν ὕδωρ* (v. 4) recalls the *ὀλίγη λιβάς* at the end of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* (v. 112) and Leonidas' description of his possessions (*τὰμὰ δὲ λιτά*, AP 6.302.7).³⁹ A further point of connection with Leonidas is Antipater's personification of the crater, which functions inter alia as a symbol of his lifestyle in just the same way as Leonidas' meal-tub does in AP 6.302.1–2: *ὁ κρητῆρ οὐ δέχεθ' ὕδροπότας ~ οὐτι πενιχρὴ | μῦς σιπύη βόσκειν οἶδε Λεωνίδεω*.

While looking back to Callimachus and Leonidas, Antipater is also in dialogue here with his fellow Greek epigrammatists resident in Rome. Philodemus (AP 11.44) and Crinagoras (AP 9.545), while modifying Callimachean or Leonidean models, retain their core ethical message. Antipater's rejection of the *λιτὸν ὕδωρ* at AP 11.20.4, then, invoking as it does this keyword of the Leonidean ethic (embodied for instance in phrases of Leonidas such as *τὰμὰ δὲ λιτά* at AP 6.302.7), is a rejection of these more recent predecessors in addition to Leonidas and Callimachus. This rejection of the ethics of *λιτότης* is hardly isolated within Antipater's corpus. He ostentatiously flouts the notions of simplicity and autarky,

³⁸ On the poetological metaphors and connections with particular passages in Callimachus, see especially Knox (1985). On the anti-Callimachean message of the epigram, see now F. Cairns (2016), 172–6.

³⁹ Piacenza (2010), 89–90.

pursuing instead a shameless, drunken hedonism, underwritten by the benefactions of patrons.⁴⁰ Consider AP 9.92, in which the poet addresses an unnamed patron who has apparently been less generous than he would have liked:

ἀρκεῖ τέττιγας μεθύσαι δρόσος· ἀλλὰ πιόντες
 αἰδεῖν κύκνων εἰσὶ γεγωνότεροι.
 ὥς καὶ αἰοδὸς ἀνὴρ ξενίων χάριν ἀνταποδοῦναι
 ὕμνους εὐέρκταις οἶδε παθὼν ὀλίγα.
 τοῦνεκά σοι πρῶτως μὲν ἀμείβομεν· ἦν δ' ἐθέλωσιν
 Μοῖραι, πολλάκι μοι κείσεται ἐν σελίσιν.
 (Antip. Thess. AP 9.92 = GPh 2)

5

A little dew suffices to intoxicate cicadas, but when they drink it,
 they are louder singers than swans.
 So too a poet in return for friendly gifts knows how to give
 poems to his benefactors, even when he has received just a little kindness.
 This is why I have written to you, and if the Moirae are willing,
 you will often lie in my pages.

Once again, we find tightly intertwined allusions to Callimachean and Leonidean texts in a poem that expresses the poet's outlook on life and poetry. Parallels with the *Aetia* prologue present themselves immediately in the comparison of the poet to a cicada and a swan in verses 1–2.⁴¹ Once this parallel is established in the opening couplet, the reader is primed to read *πολλάκι μοι* in the final line as a reference to the first two words of the *Aetia* (perhaps adding a hint of menace to Antipater's appeal to his prospective patron). Yet the *Aetia* is not the only significant background for Antipater's epigram. In his AP 11.20, the incipit *φεύγεθ'* pointed the reader back to a definite Leonidean model, AP 6.302. Here the incipit *ἀρκεῖ* points to yet another Leonidean model, AP 7.655 (along with Parmenion AP 9.43, one of only two other epigrams in the *Greek Anthology* to begin this way). If we examine Leonidas AP 7.655, we shall find that Antipater has employed a strategy in AP 9.92 similar to the one in AP 11.20, evoking a model in the incipit only to alter or invert its ethical message. In AP 7.655, the humble Alcandrus, in his self-epitaph, spurns an opulent headstone in favour of a simple burial:

ἀρκεῖ μοι γαίης μικρὴ κόνις, ἣ δὲ περισσὴ
 ἄλλον ἐπιθλίβει πλούσια κεκλιμένον
 στήλη, τὸ σκληρὸν νεκρῶν βάρος. εἴ με θανόντα
 γνῶσοντ', Ἀλκάνδρῳ τοῦτο τί Καλλιτέλεως;
 (Leon. AP 7.655 = HE 17)

⁴⁰ For the themes of drunkenness and hedonism, see Antip. Thess. AP 11.23 = GPh 38 and AP 9.305 = GPh 36, in addition to the examples already cited.

⁴¹ Cf. *Aet.* fr. 1.29–36 (comparison between the poet and a cicada) and the partially preserved vv. 39–40 (which likely contained a comparison of the poet with a swan). Gow and Page (1968), 2: 22 point out that the cicada *intoxicated* from drinking dew is a touch borrowed from Mel. AP 7.196 = HE 13.

A slight dusting of earth suffices for me. Let the extravagant
 gravestone vex some other man in wealthy repose,
 a troublesome weight for corpses. Whether, now that I am dead,
 people will know me, what does that matter to Alcandrus the son of Calliteles?

To echo like this Leonidas, a staunch proponent of autarky, in an epigram that emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between poet and patron is quite pointed. Indeed, I would suggest that it is precisely this tension between Antipater's epigram and its models that is exploited in an epigram by Parmenion: *AP* 9.43. Here Parmenion places Antipater's poem and ethical outlook into a polemical dialogue with Callimachus and Leonidas:

ἀρκεῖ μοι χλαίνης λιτὸν σκέπας, οὐδὲ τραπέζαις
 δουλεύσω Μουσέων ἄνθεα βοσκόμενος.
 μισῶ πλοῦτον ἄνουν, κολάκων τροφόν, οὐδὲ παρ' ὄφρυν
 στήσομαι· οἶδ' ὀλίγης δαιτὸς ἐλευθερίην.

(Parmen. *AP* 9.43 = *GPh* 6)

The humble covering of a cloak suffices for me, and at banquets
 I shall not slave, since I feed on the flowers of the Muses.
 I hate thoughtless wealth, the nourishment of flatterers, and before pride
 I shall not stand at attention: I know the freedom of a humble meal.

Parmenion uses the earlier epigrammatic tradition as a weapon, indicting Antipater through references to earlier models. The phrasing of the first line closely tracks Leonidas (ἀρκεῖ μοι γαίης μικρὴ κόνις, *AP* 7.655.1 ~ ἀρκεῖ μοι χλαίνης λιτὸν σκέπας, *AP* 9.43.1), mirroring at a formal level Parmenion's reassertion of the Leonidean value of λιτότης and self-sufficiency against Antipater's diametrically opposed notion of reciprocity between poet and patron. Parmenion's use of his simple cloak and, especially, of his humble food (ὀλίγης δαιτὸς ἐλευθερίην, *AP* 9.43.4) as concrete symbols of this ethical standpoint evokes not only Leonidas' bread and salt diet in *AP* 6.302, but also Philodemus' Epicurean dinner party in *AP* 11.44 and the humble hospitality offered to Theseus by Hecale in Crinagoras *AP* 9.545. Parmenion also responds tit for tat to Antipater's evocation in *AP* 9.92 of Callimachus. For a reader attuned to the Callimachean echoes in that poem, the verb μισῶ in verse 3 of Parmenion's epigram pointedly echoes Callimachus' polemical statement of principles in *AP* 12.43 = *HE* 2: ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα (v. 1) and μισέω καὶ περιφροῖτον ἐρώμενον (v. 3).⁴²

⁴² By itself, of course, the use of the same verb would not have been sufficient to establish a connection with Callimachus. It is the fact that *Antipater* had already evoked Callimachus in *AP* 9.92 = *GPh* 2 that invites the reader to think of him again now. Similarly, Antipater's use of the incipit ἀρκεῖ, also employed by Leonidas in *AP* 7.655, only gains particular significance when Parmenion in *AP* 9.43 'glosses' the Leonidean connections for us.

The case studies examined in this chapter illustrate that techniques of formal imitation and variation—down to the minute aural and graphic manipulation of model texts—are intertwined with higher-level thematic engagement. Subtle echoes of Callimachean and Leonidean texts evoke the distinctive ethical and poetic ideas of those poets as a background against which epigrammatists define their own persona and outlook. As successive generations of poets reworked these models, they participated in an ongoing ‘conversation’ not only with their Hellenistic predecessors but also with one another. The resulting discourse around shared models became a way of carrying on and transforming the epigrammatic tradition to suit new contexts, as structural patterns, individual words, and motifs were invested with layers of latent meaning waiting to be activated. When, for instance, Agathias Scholasticus created yet another anthology of epigrams, the *Cycle*, some 500 years after the compilation of Philip’s *Garland*, he returned to the imagery and diction of his predecessors, likening his anthology to a varied feast to which he has deigned to add his own *λιτὸν μέρος*, ‘small portion’ (*AP* 4.3.35).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would first like to thank the editors of this volume and the attendees of the UCL Epigram Conference. Many of the ideas originated in a PhD thesis completed under the steadfast guidance of Kathryn Gutzwiller. Alessandro Barchiesi, Richard Hunter, and David Sider offered valuable comments. Errors and shortcomings are the author’s sole responsibility.

The Riddles of the Fourteenth Book of the *Palatine Anthology*

Hellenistic, Later Imperial, Early
Byzantine, or Something More?

Simone Beta

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, not much attention has been paid to the fourteenth book of the *Palatine Anthology*, one of the most curious books of the collection assembled by Constantine Cephalas: a mixture of riddles, oracles, and mathematical problems. Apart from the most recent editors of the *Greek Anthology*,¹ only a few scholars have turned their attention to the epigrams themselves, although there has been fruitful discussion over the composition and origin of the book and its relationship with other collections, as is witnessed by more recent manuscripts.² This chapter is meant to be the starting point for a more thorough analysis of the approximately fifty riddles in *AP* 14. These poems, although much discussed between the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, have been largely overlooked recently.³

It is necessary to contextualize these epigrams into the Greek and Latin ‘riddling’ tradition, and this is what I shall try to do in this chapter,

¹ Beckby (1968) and Buffière (1970). We are waiting for the fifth volume of the new Loeb edition that is going to replace the old one published by Paton (1916–18) (the first volume was published in 2014 under the revision of M. Tueller).

² A. Cameron (1993), 135–7; Maltomini (2008), 189–95; Luz (2013), 83–99.

³ For a comprehensive treatment of these riddles, see Ohlert (1912); Schultz (1909; 1914); also Fröhner (1884), 1–95. For articles on specific epigrams of *AP* 14, see McCartney (1922; 1930); Forster (1945); Carrington (1957; 1958; 1961); Borthwick (1970); Kirstein (2008).

although I am aware that the task requires much more space and time than allowed by the limits set for a contribution to a collective volume. For instance, as far as epigrammatic poetry is concerned, it might be useful to study the connection between these riddle poems and the convivial and satirical epigrams of the *Palatine Anthology*, gathered together by Cephalas in Book 11, because through this type of contextualization it could be possible to determine what these peculiar poems can tell us about their poets, their readers, and the setting in which it is likely that they were originally delivered (i.e. the symposium).⁴ Here, however, I limit myself to pointing out what linguistic and thematic links exist between the riddling epigrams of the *Palatine Anthology* and the riddles included in the tenth book of the *Deipnosophists*, whose symposiastic setting is made explicit by the very nature of Athenaeus' work. A final step in this study will be the comparison of these epigrams to the enigmatic conundrums that became very popular in Byzantium from the beginning of the tenth century CE onwards (that is, more or less at the time of the composition of Cephalas' *Anthology*).⁵

The first part of this task has already been attempted by Christine Luz in a paper that she delivered during the conference *Mousa paizei*, organized by the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of Warsaw in 2011. Luz, who has become a real authority in the field of enigmatic poetry since 2010, when she published her excellent book on Greek *technopaegnia*, divided the fifty enigmatic riddles into four main categories according to the devices used to disguise the solutions: metonymy/analogy, pun/double meaning, paradox, and myth.⁶ Her comprehensive treatment of these epigrams has been a very welcome contribution to the field, deepening our knowledge of this quite peculiar epigrammatic subgenre, and it is precisely for this reason that I use this classification throughout my chapter. However, if we want to fully understand and appreciate these riddles, we should place them within the 'riddling' literary tradition, that is, we should try to examine them diachronically, analysing and underlining their relationship with one another.

⁴ On this subgenre, see e.g. Nisbet (2003) on imperial skoptic epigram; Schatzmann (2012) on Nicarchus; Floridi (2014a) on Lucillius; and the contributions of Floridi, Romero, and Smith in this volume. Compare also Kanellou's chapter in this volume.

⁵ On these Byzantine riddles, see Milovanović (1986); Milovanović-Barham (1993); Zanolanda (1987–9); Beta (2014a; 2014b).

⁶ Luz (2013). At p. 98, Luz, while asking what makes a riddle a riddle, gives an answer that she had already suggested in Luz (2010), 139–46, in the section *Exkurs zum γρίφος*: 'A riddle of the kind we find in the *Greek Anthology* is a description of an object or a situation which disguises this object by certain means or devices with the aim to puzzle the recipient.'

2. CONTEXTUALIZING THE RIDDLES OF THE PALATINE ANTHOLOGY

Let us start with the following case study, AP 14.28:

ἐξ ἁλὸς ἰχθυόεν γένος ἔλλαχον· εἷς δέ μ' ἄεθλος
εἰς Διονυσιακοὺς οἶδεν ἀγῶνας ἄγειν·
καὶ δέμας ἐν σταδίοισιν ἀλειψάμενος λίπ' ἐλαίῳ,
νύεα μὲν Διοῦς ὤλεσα χερσὶν ἐμαῖς·
δεύτερον αὖτε Γίγαντας ἀολλέας ἄλλοθεν ἄλλους
ἐκπέμπω πολλαῖς χείρεσιν ἐλκομένους.
(anon. AP 14.28)

From the sea I have a fishy parentage, and one contest
can bring me to the games of Dionysus.
In the stadium, after anointing my body with oil,
I slew by my hands Demeter's son.
In the second place, I send out from both sides of me
a mass of giants, pulled by many hands.⁷

In his bulky commentary, Friedrich Jacobs, the first editor of the *Palatine Anthology*, acknowledges that he was not able to solve the riddle.⁸ Other scholars, though, did attempt to solve it: Fröhner suggested that the solution is *κάνθαρος* (a fish, a drinking cup, the beetle, one of the three inlets of the harbour of Piraeus); Ohlert proposed *ὄνος* (another fish, another drinking cup, the millstone, and the capstan); Carrington thought of *λύχνος* (again a fish, but also the lamp used to light up the banquets, to chase off darkness, and to help seafarers).⁹ These solutions have something in common: they all point towards a symposiastic milieu, 'one of the most common performance contexts for riddles'.¹⁰

However, what I am interested in is not the correct answer to the *aenigma* (*αἴνιγμα*). My attention rather goes to the fact that the structure of this riddling epigram is based on homonymy. Whatever the answer is, it must be a name that means different things: more precisely, all the different things hinted at in the text of the poem.

Such a poem follows a pattern that the ancient Greeks knew quite well. At Athenaeus 10.453b–c, when, on the grammarian Aemilianus Maurus' advice, the 'learned banqueters' begin to discuss riddles, someone speaks of a very

⁷ For the epigrams of AP 14, I use the edition and old translations of Paton (1916–18), which I adapt occasionally. Translations of other texts are my own, unless otherwise stated.

⁸ Jacobs (1803), 3.2: 363 (on riddles see 342–65). The same pessimistic conclusion can be read in the note of Paton (1916–18), 5: 41 ('the answer has not been guessed').

⁹ Fröhner (1884), 3–5; Ohlert (1912), 183–4; Carrington (1957), 340.

¹⁰ Luz (2013), 93 n. 20. There are many such riddles in AP 14, e.g. 14.23 (a fish cooked in its own juice), 14.26 (a linen towel), 14.30 (a lyre), 14.36 (another fish), 14.47 (a lamp), and 14.52 (wine).

ancient (ἀρχαιοτάτος) type of riddle (γρίφος), which has to do with logical concepts and logical reasoning (λογικός) and is closely related to the true nature of the enigmatic technique (οἰκειότατος τῆς τοῦ γριφεύειν φύσεως).¹¹ In this very interesting passage Athenaeus quotes three examples; the third one is the following:

τί ταῦτ' ὃν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ἐν θαλάττῃ;¹²
(Ath. 10.453b)

What is the same in the sky, on earth, and in the sea?

The logical process that leads to the answer involves the use of homonymy. As the speaker explains, καὶ γὰρ ἄρκτος καὶ ὄφις καὶ αἰετὸς καὶ κύων ἔστιν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν γῇ καὶ ἐν θαλάσσει ('the bear, the snake, the eagle, and the dog are found in the sky, on earth, and in the sea', *ibid.*). There is more than one possible answer, and they all constitute names used for denoting not only the most common creatures that lived on earth but also the less common ones that lived in the sea: ἄρκτος, apart from the bear, was also the name of a crustacean; ὄφις, in addition to the snake, was also the name of an eel; αἰετός, apart from the eagle, was also the name of a fish similar to a ray; κύων was the name of both the dog and a kind of shark. Moreover, all these terms also indicated some famous celestial constellations.

Athenaeus' speaker states that the riddle just mentioned with this specific structure was 'very archaic' (ἀρχαιοτάτος). He is right because, as the evidence shows, the riddle is much older than Athenaeus. In the prologue of the *Wasps* (vv. 15–19), Aristophanes pokes fun at one of his most beloved targets, Cleonymus, a notorious coward, by having the slave Xanthias recount to his colleague Sosias the weird dream that he has just seen:

ἔδόκουν αἰετὸν
καταπτάμενον εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν μέγαν πάνυ
ἀναρπάσαντα τοῖς ὄνυξιν ἀσπίδα
φέρειν ἐπίχαλκον ἀνεκὰς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν,
κάπειτα ταύτην ἀποβαλεῖν Κλεώνυμον.
(Ar. V. 15–19)

It seemed to me that an eagle,
a gigantic bird, descended upon the marketplace;
it seized a brazen buckler with its talons
and bore it away into the highest heavens;
then I saw it was Cleonymus that had thrown it away.

¹¹ On the difference between the fairly rare word γρίφος and the more usual αἴνιγμα, see J. Ehlers (1867); Luz (2013), 97–8.

¹² *Carm. pop.* fr. 10 Diehl. The other two riddles are *Carm. pop.* frs 8 and 9 Diehl.

Sosias interprets the dream by saying that ‘there is no difference between Cleonymus and a riddle’, since from now on ‘every guest will be able to ask the other banqueters the following riddle: “How can one and the same animal have cast away his buckler both on land, in the sky, and at sea?”’ (V. 20–3).¹³ Thanks to this passage, which happens to constitute not only the first occurrence of the word *γρίφος* in Greek literature, but also the first evidence for the habit of asking riddles during symposia, we can conclude that these kinds of riddles based on homonymy remained popular from the classical to the Byzantine period.¹⁴

This type of riddle was popular in Latin literature as well. In the first century CE (i.e. long after Aristophanes, but before Athenaeus), Quintilian warned his pupils against using words that had many different meanings, because this might cause obscurity. As a case study, he cites the word *taurus* and says that, unless it is specified what the word means, it will not be possible to understand whether we are speaking of an animal, a mountain, a constellation, a man’s name, or the root of a tree.¹⁵

Later on in time, between the fourth and the fifth century CE, the Latin poet Symphosius (or Symposius)¹⁶ wrote a riddle equally based on the many different meanings of the word *taurus* but with a funny mythological note, because the poet chose to put the riddle in the mouth of the white bull that, together with Poseidon’s anger, caused poor Pasiphae’s crazy love:

*moechus eram regis, sed lignea membra sequebar;
et Cilicum mons sum, sed non sum nomine solo;
et vehor in caelis et in ipsis ambulo terris.*

(Symphosius 32)

I was the lover of a member of the royal family, but the goal of my wooing were wooden limbs;
and I am a mountain of the Cilician people, but I have many names;
and I move in the sky, and I walk on the earth itself.

Let us forget for a moment these Latin texts and go back to Athenaeus. Unlike the riddles in the *Palatine Anthology*, which are all anonymous, the riddles quoted by Athenaeus are often attributed to an author (in most cases a tragic or a comic poet);¹⁷ the main question related to the source (or

¹³ Οὐδὲν ἄρα γρίφου διαφέρει Κλεώνυμος. | ... προσερεῖ τις τοῖσι συμπόταις, λέγων | ὅτι ταῦτόν ἐν γῇ τ’ ἀπέβαλεν οὐρανῷ | κἀν τῇ θαλάττῃ θηρίον τὴν ἀσπίδα’. On Cleonymus’ cowardice, see Storey (1989).

¹⁴ We also learn that a riddle could be uttered in iambic trimeters (Aristophanes), prose (Athenaeus), and elegiac couplets (AP). The Byzantine poets added their own metrical patterns (dodecasyllables and pentadecasyllables).

¹⁵ Quint. *Inst.* 8.2.13.

¹⁶ On Symphosius, see Bergamin (2005); Leary (2014).

¹⁷ The riddles quoted by Athenaeus were gathered for the first time by Cougny (1890). There are seventy-seven enigmatic epigrams not included in Cephala’s collection (a fairly good number, when we compare it to the total of fifty riddles included in the *Palatine Anthology*).

sources) used by Athenaeus has been recently discussed by Jan Kwapisz. According to Kwapisz, the first collections of riddles date from the Hellenistic period, and this is likely to be true; it is also right that Cephalas drew his material from the (more) famous collections (Meleager's, Philip's, and Agathias' anthologies), while there were also the (less) famous collections used by Athenaeus as sources for the riddles in his work (e.g. the Simonidean riddles and Philitas' *Paignia*).¹⁸ But is it possible to know what these collections looked like?

In some manuscripts, riddles quoted by Athenaeus (but not collected by Cephalas) are found together with riddles collected by Cephalas (but not cited by Athenaeus); moreover, we cannot rule out the possibility that some enigmatic epigrams inserted by Cephalas into his own collection were later on excluded by J, the editor of the Palatine manuscript.¹⁹ For example, in the *Laurentianus* 32.16, a manuscript compiled by Maximus Planudes between 1280 and 1283, we find a riddle quoted by Athenaeus (10.457b–c) but not by Cephalas, followed by a long series of riddles taken from *AP* 14 that is then interrupted by a riddle on Penelope that is quoted by neither Athenaeus nor Cephalas.²⁰ The riddle handed down in Athenaeus is the famous (*περιφερόμενον*) *aenigma* of the five men and the ten ships;²¹ the riddle on Penelope (better put, the riddle addressed to Penelope) is elsewhere attributed to Emperor Julian.²²

Again, in the *Parisinus Suppl. Graecus* 690, a manuscript written in the twelfth century CE, we come across, among a fairly good number of later Byzantine riddles, an *aenigma* quoted by Cephalas, namely *AP* 14.9. It is a smart riddle:

ἄνδρ' ἐμὸν ἔκταν' ἔκυρός, ἔκυρόν δ' ἔκτανεν ἀνήρ,
καὶ δαῖρ ἔκυρόν, καὶ ἔκυρός γενέτην.

(anon. *AP* 14.9)

My father-in-law slew my husband; my husband slew my father-in-law;
my brother-in-law slew my father; my father-in-law slew my father.

The solution—Andromache—is not easy, but not too difficult for those who are acquainted with Greek mythology, and is given and discussed in the manuscript, since the text of the riddle is followed by a thorough explanation:

¹⁸ See Kwapisz (2013b), who discusses the 'collection' of Simonidean riddles, the book attributed to the mysterious Cleobulina, the treatises written by Clearchus of Soli, Philitas' *Paignia*, and the polymetric poems composed by Simias of Rhodes.

¹⁹ According to A. Cameron (1993), 298–328, J is Constantine the Rhodian. This identification is now widely accepted (with some exceptions, such as Orsini 2000).

²⁰ A. Cameron (1993), 202–16.

²¹ This riddle has been solved in two different ways by Caponigro (1984) and Fabbro (2003); for a third solution, more convincing (at least in my opinion), see Napoli (2015).

²² This riddle was first edited by Cougny (Cougny 23 = Milovanović 43).

εἰδέναι χρὴ ὡς ἡ Ἀνδρομάχη ἐστίν, ἡ τούτοις κεκρημένη τοῖς στίχοις. αὕτη γὰρ κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν γαμετὴ γέγονε τοῦ Ἑκτορος τοῦ Πριάμου παιδός. ταύτης τὸν πατέρα, φημι δὴ Ἡετίωνα, ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἀνείλεν ἐν τῷ Τρωϊκῷ πολέμῳ. τὸν δὲ Ἀχιλλέα κατατοξεύει ὁ Πάρις ὁ τοῦ Ἑκτορος ἀδελφός. μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς Τροίας ἡ Ἀνδρομάχη αἰχμάλωτος γενομένη συνάπτεται πρὸς γάμον τῷ Πύρρῳ τῷ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως παιδί. λέγει οὖν ὅτι τὸν ἐμὸν ἄνδρα ἐφόνευσεν ὁ ἐμὸς πενθερός, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸν Ἑκτορα τὸν γενόμενόν μου πρῶην ἄνδρα ἐφόνευσεν ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς, ὁ νῦν μου πενθερός, ὡς ἀπὸ Πύρρου. εἶτα λέγει ὅτι τὸν ἐμὸν πενθερόν ἀνείλεν ὁ ἐμὸς ἀνὴρ, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ Πύρρος ὁ ἀνὴρ μου τὸν Πριάμον τὸν γενόμενόν μου πρῶην πενθερόν ἐφόνευσεν. εἶτα λέγει ὅτι ἀνείλεν ὁ ἀνδράδελφός μου τὸν ἐμὸν πενθερόν, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ὁ Πάρις ὁ ἀδελφός τοῦ Ἑκτορος τὸν ἐμὸν πενθερόν τὸν Ἀχιλλέα. εἶτα λέγει ὅτι ὁ ἐμὸς πενθερός ἀνείλε τὸν ἐμὸν πατέρα, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς τὸν Ἡετίωνα.²³

You need to know that the solution is Andromache. She uses these lines. At first she was married to Hector, Priam's son. Her father, I mean Eëtion, was killed by Achilles during the Trojan War. Paris, Hector's brother, kills Achilles with an arrow. After the conquest of Troy, Andromache becomes a slave and is forced to marry Pyrrhus, Achilles' son. She says that 'my father-in-law killed my husband', that is, 'Achilles (who is now my father-in-law, because of Pyrrhus) killed Hector, who was my ex-husband'. Then she says that 'my husband killed my father-in-law', that is, 'Pyrrhus killed Priam, who was my ex-father-in-law'. Then she says that 'my brother-in-law killed my father-in-law', that is, 'Paris, Hector's brother, killed my father-in-law Achilles'. Then she says that 'my father-in-law killed my father', that is, 'Achilles killed Eëtion'.

The presence, in this very manuscript, of two out of the three lines of the riddle of the five men and ten ships,²⁴ together with poems handed down to us in a different collection (Cephalas), may therefore prove that anthologies of epigrams, composed at very different times, existed before the well-known one of Cephalas.²⁵

²³ The heading of this very long explanation (f. 79r) is the question, 'which is the person that utters these lines?' (ποῖόν ἐστι πρόσωπον τὸ ταῦτα λέγον;). It is preceded by the text of the riddle (called ζήτημα) in a slightly different version (ἄνδρ' ἐμὸν εἶλεν ἐκυρός, ἐκυρόν δ' ἐμὸς ἔκτανεν ἀνὴρ, | καὶ λαέκυρον (sic!) καὶ ἐκυρός γενέτην) and by its 'interpretation' or, better, 'paraphrase' (ἐρμηνεία): τὸν ἐμὸν ἄνδρα ὁ ἐμὸς ἀνείλε πενθερός. καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν πενθερόν ἀνείλεν ὁ ἐμὸς ἀνὴρ. καὶ ὁ ἀδελφός τοῦ ἀνδρός μου ἀνείλε τὸν ἐμὸν πενθερόν. καὶ ὁ ἐμὸς πενθερός ἀνείλε τὸν πατέρα μου ('My father-in-law killed my husband. And my husband killed my father-in-law. And my husband's brother killed my father-in-law. And my father-in-law killed my father').

²⁴ See p. 124 in this chapter.

²⁵ On this manuscript, see the description by Rochefort (1950), along with the critical remarks by Lauxtermann (2003), 329–33. Scattered in the manuscript are twenty-one riddles: nine of them have been first edited by Dilthey (1891), 6–8, while the others (elsewhere attributed to Julian the Emperor, Cristopher of Mytilene, John Mauropous, Michael Psellus, Eustathius Macrembolites, and Eustathius Canicles) are either known to us from other sources or still unpublished. Three are preserved (wholly or partially) in the *Palatine Anthology* (i.e. AP 14.6, 14.9, and 14.105).

The Andromache riddle is used by Luz as the first example of mythological riddles. Her second case study is another Palatine epigram, AP 14.32, which is worth mentioning here:²⁶

κτανθεὶς τὸν κτείναντα κατέκτανον· ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν οὐδ' ὥς
ἦλυθεν εἰς Αἴδην· αὐτὰρ ἔγωγ' ἔθανον.

(anon. AP 14.32)

Having been slain, I slew the slayer; he did not go
to Hades, though; but I died.

The figures in question are Heracles and Nessus: the centaur Nessus, murdered by Heracles, killed his killer by poisoning him with his own blood. Although we cannot tell who wrote this elegiac couplet, we know very well the source of this idea. In the last part of Sophocles' *Women of Trachis* (vv. 1159–63), the dying hero Heracles remembers the prophecy that his father Zeus had given him: 'It was prophesied to me by my father long ago that I would never die at the hands of anyone who breathed but at the hands of the one who was dead and lived in Hades. So this monster the centaur, as the divine prophecy had foretold me, has killed me, I being alive and he being dead.'²⁷ The words uttered by the Sophoclean character (ζώντά μ' ἔκτεινεν θανάων) are quite similar to the words that the anonymous poet put in Nessus' mouth (κτανθεὶς τὸν κτείναντα κατέκτανον).²⁸

Cephalas' anthology—not only the one we possess thanks to the Palatine manuscript but also the other, smaller selections that circulated during the following centuries²⁹—contributed greatly to the diffusion of the riddle sub-genre, since many Byzantine poets such as Christopher of Mytilene, John Mauropous, and John Geometres took inspiration from the epigrams collected by Cephalas.³⁰ However, as I have already argued in this chapter, there were probably other anthologies too, with other interesting riddles that inspired later poets. These were not necessarily more comprehensive than that of Cephalas, but they likely contained different poems. This process may lie

²⁶ On these riddles, see Luz (2013), 91–2.

²⁷ Ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἦν πρόφαντον ἐκ πατρὸς πάλαι, | πρὸς τῶν πνεόντων μηδενὸς θανεῖν ποτε, | ἀλλ' ὅστις Αἴδου φθίμενος οἰκήτωρ πέλοι. | ὅδ' οὖν ὁ θῆρ Κένταυρος, ὡς τὸ θεῖον ἦν | πρόφαντον, οὕτω ζώντά μ' ἔκτεινεν θανάων. Translation adapted from Lloyd-Jones (1994).

²⁸ The third mythological riddle mentioned by Luz (2013) is AP 14.38 (the reciprocal murder of Oedipus' sons). The other riddles on mythological figures are AP 14.25, 14.27, and 14.59.

²⁹ These minor anthologies have been studied by A. Cameron (1993) and by Maltomini (2008).

³⁰ On these Byzantine poets, see Lauxtermann (2003) and Bernard and Demoen (2012); on John Geometres, see van Opstall (2008); on Christopher of Mytilene, see De Groote (2012); on Christopher of Mytilene and John Mauropous, see Bernard and Livanos (2018).

behind the following smart *aenigma* in the Byzantine ‘collection’ of Basil Megalomytes, a poet whom Alan Cameron called a ‘mysterious figure (of quite uncertain date)’:³¹

ἔστι τις φύσις θήλεια, φωνήεσσα καὶ λάλος,
καὶ βρέφη περικόλπια σώζει καὶ περικρύπτει.
ἄγλωσσα δὲ καὶ λαλιᾶς ἀδίδακτα τὰ βρέφη·
ἀλλ’ ὅμως ἔντρανον αὐτοῖς καὶ γεγωνὸν τὸ φθέγμα·
κὰν τοῖς ποντίοις ὕδασιν οἷς θέλουσι λαλοῦσι,
καὶ τοὺς ἐν νήσοις φθάνουσι καὶ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἡπείροις.
πολλοῖς δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἀκούειν καὶ παροῦσι·
τῆς δ’ ἀκοῆς τὴν αἴσθησιν κωφὴν ἔχει τὰ βρέφη.
(Basil Megalomytes 39 Boissonade = 26 Milovanović)

There is a feminine being, speaking and talkative
which keeps and hides its babes beneath its bosom.
The babes are tongueless, since nobody has taught them to speak;
but their voice is high and sonorous;
they speak to the mortals they desire over the waves of the sea,
and over the islands, and over the lands.
Even when they are present, it is not possible to hear them;
but the sense of hearing of the babes is dull.

The brilliant idea that lies behind this riddle does not belong to the Byzantine author who wrote the poem; rather it stems from a lost comedy of Antiphanes, *Sappho*, and is quoted by Athenaeus (10.450e–1b) in the following form:

ἔστι φύσις θήλεια βρέφη σώζουσ’ ὑπὸ κόλποις
αὐτῆς, ὄντα δ’ ἄφωνα βοῇν ἵστησι γεγωνὸν
καὶ διὰ πόντιον οἶδμα καὶ ἡπείρου διὰ πάσης
οἷς ἐθέλει θνητῶν, τοῖς δ’ οὐδὲ παροῦσιν ἀκούειν
ἔξεστιν· κωφὴν δ’ ἀκοῆς αἴσθησιν ἔχουσιν.
(Antiph. fr. 194.1–5 K–A = 7 and 8 Cougny)

There is a feminine being which keeps its babes safe
beneath its bosom; though voiceless, they raise a sonorous cry
over the waves of the sea and across all the dry land,
reaching whomever of the mortals they desire, and they can even be heard
by those who are not there; but the sense of hearing they have is dull.³²

The two texts are very similar, and the same applies to their solutions: in Antiphanes, the answer is ἐπιστολή (‘letter’, ‘epistle’), while in Basil it is βίβλος

³¹ A. Cameron (1970b), 342 does not seem to be convinced by the early date (eleventh century) proposed by Cantarella (1992), 2: 763. On the main features of Basil’s ‘collection’ (and on the reason why I prefer to use scare quotes when I deal with Byzantine ‘collections’ of riddles), see Beta (2014a).

³² Translation adapted from Gulick (1930).

(‘book’).³³ The real difference between them lies in the metre: the iambic trimeter, so typical of Greek comedy, has changed into pentadecasyllables, the political verse so beloved by the Byzantine poets.³⁴

Since the riddle is not present in Cephalas’ collection (or, better, since it is not found in the only complete revision of the anthology that we possess, i.e. the Palatine manuscript), where did Basil take it from? Did he find it in Athenaeus? We cannot exclude this possibility. If Basil found the riddle there, we would expect him to have used other riddles attested in Athenaeus for the composition of other poems. However, on the basis of the surviving material, he did not do this. Therefore the other possible explanation is that Basil found the riddle in an anthology that contained riddles dating from different periods, including a few that survived in *AP* 14 as well.

There are further examples that strengthen this hypothesis. One falls under another category of riddles that, according to Luz, contains ‘a few special types’ of *aenigmata*, that is, riddles that have wordplay as their prop.³⁵ She offers two Palatine riddles of this type that are almost identical, and I cite the first one, *AP* 14.105:³⁶

εἰμὶ χαμαῖζηλον ζώων μέλος· ἦν δ’ ἀφέλης μου
γράμμα μόνον, κεφαλῆς γίνομαι ἄλλο μέρος·
ἦν δ’ ἕτερον, ζῶον πάλιν ἔσσομαι· ἦν δὲ καὶ ἄλλο,
οὐ μόνον εὐρήσεις, ἀλλὰ διηκόσια.³⁷

(anon. *AP* 14.105)

I am a part of an animal which affects the ground; if you take
a single letter away from me, I become a part of the head;
if you take away another, I shall again be an animal;
if you take another away, you will not find me one, but two hundred.

The epigram is based on one of the most typical enigmatic wordplays: the elimination of the first letter of a word that results in the creation of another, different word: *πούς* (‘foot’) turns into *οὖς* (‘ear’), then into *ῦς* (‘pig’), and finally into *σ* (the letter that indicates the number 200). This kind of wordplay was extremely popular among Byzantine poets, as is evident from the popularity of the riddle of the shrimp (*καρίς*), quoted (among others) by Basil

³³ Antiphanes gives the solution of the riddle in vv. 27–31 of fr. 194 K–A: *θήλεια μὲν νυν ἐστὶ φύσις ἐπιστολή, | βρέφη δ’ ἐν αὐτῇ περιφέρει τὰ γράμματα· | ἄφωνα δ’ ὄντα <ταῦτα> τοῖς πόρρω λαλεῖ | οἷς βούλεθ’ ἕτερος δ’ ἂν τύχη τις πλησίον | ἐστὼς ἀναγινώσκοντος οὐκ ἀκούσεται* (‘This feminine being is an epistle: the babes within her are the letters it carries round; though voiceless, they talk to whom they desire when they are far away; but if another happens to be standing near when the letter is read, it will not be heard’). The solution to Basil’s riddle was written by a second hand in the right margin of the manuscript and was transcribed by Boissonade (*Par. gr.* 968, f. 208v).

³⁴ On the political verse, see Jeffreys (1974); Lauxtermann (1999).

³⁵ Luz (2013), 93–5.

³⁶ The second riddle is *AP* 14.106, discussed *ibid.*, 95, n. 24.

³⁷ On this poem, see also Hopkinson (1994).

Megalomytes.³⁸ Through the progressive loss of its initial letters, the tasty crustacean (the first clue is the sentence ‘I live in the sea and I am food for the mortals’) becomes the drill (ἀρίς), then the nose (ρίς), then strength (ἰς), and in the end the number 200 (σ). It is no surprise, therefore, that in the ‘collection’ of Basil Megalomytes we find not only one but two different versions of the same Palatine riddle:

κατώτερον μὲν εἶμι τῶν ὅλων μέρος·
 ἀνώτερον δὲ γίνομαι πάλιν ὅλων,
 πρώτου γράμματος ἀφαιρεθέντος μόνου.
 τοῦ δευτέρου δὲ πάλιν ἐκβεβλημένου,
 κλήσιν παρηνθὺς λαμβάνω τετραπόδου.
 (Basil Megalomytes 12 Boissonade = 55 Cougny = 112 Milovanović)

I am a lower part of the body;
 but I become an upper part of the body,
 if just the first letter is taken away from me.
 But if also the second letter is thrown away,
 I soon take the name of a four-footed animal.

and

ἐν γράμμασι τέσσαρσι συλλαβὴν μίαν
 εἰς κλήσιν αὐχῶ· τῶν βροτῶν δ’ εἶμι μέλος.
 ὁ γοῦν τὸ πρῶτον ἐξελὼν τῶν γραμμάτων
 εὔρη με πάντως ἄλλο τι βροτῶν μέλος·
 τούτων δὲ πάλιν τις τὸ πρῶτον ἐκξέσας,
 5
 ἔξει με πάντως ζῶον ἐν τῶν χρησίμων,
 ἐν τῇ τελευτῇ καὶ μόνῃ βροτοῦς τρέφον.
 (Basil Megalomytes 36 Boissonade = 56 Cougny)

I declare loudly that my name is composed
 of four letters in just one syllable: I am a part of the mortal body.
 The man who cancels the first of the letters
 will find out that I am positively another part of mortal men;
 if someone wipes out again the first of these letters,
 he will have me, by all means one of the useful animals,
 an animal that, after its death, feeds the mortal men.

As in Antiphanes’ riddle, the metre here has changed; this time, though, the elegiac couplets have turned into dodecasyllables.³⁹

³⁸ Basil Megalomytes 11 Boissonade = 54 Cougny = 110 Milovanović. For the popularity of the riddle, see Beta (2014a), 216–18. Another similar riddle (even more popular than the shrimp riddle) is the honeycomb riddle (Michael Psellus 47 Westerink = 13 Boissonade = 40 Cougny = 128 Milovanović), whose solution is the word *κηρίον*; for its popularity, see Beta (2014a), 224–5.

³⁹ On this metre, see Maas (1903); Lauxtermann (1999).

However, even if *AP* 14.105 was composed during the imperial period (as Neil Hopkinson thinks,⁴⁰ and I do not have any serious reason to contradict his opinion), the origins of this kind of wordplay are older, although this type of riddling epigram cannot belong to the ‘very archaic riddles’ mentioned by Athenaeus.⁴¹ Since another example of this technique is found in the *Syrinx* attributed to Theocritus, that is, in *AP* 15.21, we might infer that this kind of wordplay dates back at least to the Hellenistic period. In this poem we find the riddling expression ‘the edge of a shield lacking a π ’ (πιλιπὲς . . . τέρμα σάκους, v. 4).⁴² What does this strange sentence mean? It means that, if we take away the letter π from the word Πίτυς (the name of the nymph loved by the god Pan), we get the word ἴτυς (‘the edge of a shield’).

If we now move on from Greece to Rome, we can find examples of similar wordplay that surely belong to the imperial era. In the biography of Emperor Tiberius, Suetonius tells us that, because of his fondness for drinking wine, Tiberius Claudius Nero was given the funny nickname ‘Biberius Caldius Mero’, a triple wordplay where the shrewd displacement of some letters turns the emperor into a lover of warm, unmixed wine (Suet. *Tib.* 42).⁴³

In this case, the Greek example precedes the Roman one; but other types of riddles in the *Palatine Anthology* happen to be more recent than their Roman equivalents. Let us look at some examples of the so-called charade, a type of wordplay wherein the union of two different small words creates a third, longer word. This type of wordplay can be found twice in *AP* 14, and Luz mentions the related epigrams in the final section of her analysis dedicated to the ‘few special types’ of riddles.⁴⁴ The first one is *AP* 14.31:

οἶνον τὴν ἑτέραν γράφε μητέρα, καὶ θὲς ἐπ’ ἄρθρῳ
ἄρθρον· τοῦ πάτρης πατρὸς ἄκοιτις ὄρῃς.
(anon. *AP* 14.31)

Write down the second mother of wine, then add a ‘limb’
to the ‘limb’: you see him whose fatherland was her father’s wife.⁴⁵

Οἶνος (‘wine’) is a metonymy for the god Dionysus, whose mother was Semele. However, we can argue that the god’s second ‘mother’ was Zeus or, better, his thigh (μηρός) where Zeus put the fetus of his son after his mother died. If we then add a ‘limb’ to this word, in other words if we add the article δ (in the

⁴⁰ Hopkinson (1994), 28 and 105. ⁴¹ See pp. 121–2 in this chapter.

⁴² For a recent commentary, see Kwapisz (2013a).

⁴³ In Greek poetry, the displacement of letters, first attested in an epigram by Meleager (*AP* 5.192 = *HE* 57), becomes a quite popular form of wordplay in the skoptic epigrams of the *Palatine Anthology* (*AP* 11.69, 11.260, 11.337). As for the Latin examples of the elimination of the first letter, the first occurrences are detected in Symphosius 36 (*porcus/Orcus*) and 74 (*lapis/apis*); this kind of wordplay becomes more popular with Aldhelm of Malmesbury (riddles 63 and 86) and other English poets (Eusebius and Tatwine).

⁴⁴ Luz (2013), 93–4.

⁴⁵ The second example (whose solution is still under dispute) is *AP* 14.16.

language of the grammarians, this is what ἄρθρον means),⁴⁶ we get the word Ὅμηρος (Homer), the poet who, according to some authors, was born in Smyrna, the town whose name derives from a woman, Smyrna or Myrrha, who was notorious for having had an incestuous relationship with her father.⁴⁷

Setting a date for this couplet is almost impossible. However, it is quite difficult to argue that it precedes the oldest example of charade, a poem that survives in Marcus Terentius Varro's *On the Latin Language* (fr. 55):

*semel minusne an bis minus sit nescio,
an utrumque eorum; ut quondam audiui dicier,
Jovi ipsi regi noluit concedere.*

(Varro LL fr. 55)

I do not know if he is 'minus once', or 'minus twice',
or both of these. But, as once I heard it said,
he refused to give his place to Jupiter himself, the king of the gods.⁴⁸

The solution to this charade is the name of the god Terminus: after *semel minus* and *bis minus*, we have in fact *ter minus*. When the Romans started to build the temple of Jupiter in the Capitolium, they did not dare to remove the shrine of Terminus and decided to leave inside the new temple a *cippus*, a small pillar with an inscription, to serve as a boundary stone that marked the sacred place of the ancient god (Livy 1.55).

Since this kind of wordplay was present not only in Rome and Greece, but also at different times, no one should be surprised that similar charades are attested in Byzantine riddles as well, as in the conundrum that we find in two other Byzantine 'collections' attributed to Michael Psellus and Eustathius Macrembolites:

*κλήσις πέφυκα καὶ θεοῦ δηλῶ χάριν·
ἐκ σχετλιασμοῦ συλλαβὰς φέρω δύο.
πτῶσίς με θῆλυς συμπεραίνει δευτέρα
ὑπὲρ γυναικός, εἰ διαίρειν με θέλεις.*⁴⁹

I am a name and show the loving grace of God;
I bring two syllables coming out of a complaint.
If you want to cut me into pieces, a second feminine case
brings me into completion, the woman who came before the Woman.

⁴⁶ The first occurrence of the word ἄρθρον with the meaning 'article' is to be found in Arist. Po. 1457a6; see also 'Rh. Al.' 1435a35. This usage becomes popular thanks to the Stoics, e.g. Chrysippus (SVF fr. 147).

⁴⁷ The most celebrated version of Myrrha's myth is Ov. *Met.* 10.298–502; for a Greek summary of it, see Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.14.4, where the name of Myrrha's father is Teias. The fruit of their incestuous love was Adonis.

⁴⁸ The fragment is quoted in Gell. *NA* 12.6. Varro's *On the Latin Language* was comprised of twenty-five books, but only six survive today, partly mutilated.

⁴⁹ In Michael Psellus' 'collection', the riddle is 50 Westerink = 16 Boissonade = 43 Cougny = 101 Milovanović. In Eustathius' 'collection', it is the fourth item of the fourth section (see Treu 1893, 15).

The solution to this charade is 'John the Baptist' (Ἰωάννης). His name, which means 'God has been gracious', derives from the combination of the 'exclamation of pain' ἰώ ('oh!') with the genitive case of the name of the 'woman who came before the Woman'—in other words, of Ἀννη, the mother of the Virgin Mary, the woman par excellence. The Christian background of the charade, a feature that we find in many other Byzantine riddles, underlines the fact that, with these authors, we have left the classical world; and this is also true for the majority of Latin riddles dating from the same period.⁵⁰

3. IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION: THE LONG LIFE OF A RIDDLE

In conclusion, setting these epigrams in a wider context is very important for fully understanding both the techniques employed by the anonymous poets and the characteristics of the subgenre to which they belong. Each riddle possesses its own story, which should not be separated from the stories of the riddles that precede and follow it in the sequence of epigrams in the collection where it has been preserved; rather it should be compared to and linked with them.

The life cycle of most of the riddles is very broad. It suffices to look at the life cycle of the most celebrated one, the *aenigma* of the Sphinx solved by Oedipus: it is first attested in the epic *Oedipodea*, then used by Euripides in his lost *Oedipus*, later quoted in hexameters by Athenaeus (who has taken it from the *Tragodoumena* of Asclepiades of Tragilus), and of course preserved in the *Palatine Anthology* (AP 14.64).⁵¹ Its popularity was not unknown to the Byzantines; we find the riddle in John Tzetzes' commentary on Lycophron's *Alexandra* (specifically v. 7),⁵² and a shorter version of it (just one single dodecasyllable) is attributed to Isaac Argyros, a mathematician who lived in the fourteenth century:

⁵⁰ The biblical background of many Byzantine riddles is evident in many texts. The Christian background of the riddles of Aldhelm of Malmesbury and other English poets is beyond dispute; for an overview, see Pavlovskis (1988). Bergamin (2005) thinks that Symphosius has been influenced by some Christian writers, while Leary (2014) is sceptical of this.

⁵¹ *Oedipodea* fr. 2* West; E. *TrGF* fr. 540a (first edited by Turner et al. 1962, *P. Oxy.* 27, no. 2459); Asclep. Tragil. *FGrHist* 12F7a (quoted at Ath. 10.456b). A couple of comic fragments, cited in Ath. 2.49c–d, allude to the riddle (i.e. Epich. fr. 147 K–A and Ar. fr. 545 K–A). Thanks to another papyrus, edited by Parsons (1999), we can read the obscene version of the riddle that was composed by the epigrammatist Nicarchus (*P. Oxy.* 66, no. 4502, vv. 30–7); for a recent commentary, see Schatzmann (2012), 365–70.

⁵² See Leone's edition of Tzetzes' commentary (2002).

ὁ τετράπους δίπους τε καὶ πάλιν τρίπους.
(Milovanović 77)

The four-footed is two-footed and again three-footed.⁵³

These remarks concern other riddles as well. In the chapter of his book on Indo-European poetry and myth dedicated to the ‘year riddles’—the meaning of this term (which he uses in the title) will soon be clear—West demonstrates how the answer to the riddling epigram AP 14.101 attributed to Cleobulus of Lindos, one of the seven wise men, refers to ‘universals of human experience such as the elements and the season’:⁵⁴

εἷς ὁ πατήρ, παῖδες δυοκαίδεκα· τῶν δὲ ἐκάστω
παῖδες <δὺς> τριήκοντα διάνδιχα εἶδος ἔχουσιν·
αἱ μὲν λευκαὶ ἔασιν ἰδεῖν, αἱ δ’ αὖτε μέλαιναν·
ἀθάνατοι δὲ τ’ εἶναι, ἀποφθινύθουσιν ἅπασαι.
(Cleob. of Lindos AP 14.101)

There is one father and twelve children. Each of these
has twice thirty children of different aspect;
some of them we see to be white, but the others are black;
though immortal, they all perish.⁵⁵

There is no room here for mentioning the many parallels adduced by West for the image of the year as a tree, whose origins probably go back to the Persian–Arabic world. However, it might be interesting to note that the riddle became popular in modern Europe. Some Persian short stories rich in riddles were translated into French by François Pétis de la Croix in 1710, and among the stories published by him under the title *Les Mille et un jours* there was *The History of Prince Calaf and of the Princess of China*, the source of Giacomo Puccini’s *Turandot*. Well, the third riddle of the French version (the last riddle that Calaf has to solve in order to win the princess’ hand) is a short refashioning of the Greek parallel: ‘Which is the tree whose leaves are white on one side and black on the other?’⁵⁶ The same riddle was then translated into Italian by Carlo Gozzi for his famous theatrical version performed for the first time in Venice in 1772, and Friedrich Schiller then translated this Italian version into German for his own play, which was performed on stage five

⁵³ The riddle was first edited by Lambros (1923), 210 n. 37.

⁵⁴ West (2007), 370–2.

⁵⁵ On this riddle (also quoted in D.L. 1.90–1), see also Luz (2013), 86; Kwapisz (2016).

⁵⁶ *Quel est l’arbre... dont toutes les feuilles sont blanches d’un côté et noires de l’autre?* (p. 453). The first two riddles are (p. 434): *Dites-moi quelle est la créature qui est de tout pays, amie de tout le monde, et qui ne saurait souffrir son semblable?* (‘Tell me which is the creature that is everywhere, that is a friend of everybody and that would not be able to endure something similar?’; answer: the sun) and *Quelle est la mère... qui, après avoir mis au monde ses enfants, les dévore tous lorsqu’ils sont devenus grands?* (‘Which mother devours all the children she has begotten when they have grown up?’; answer: the sea).

times at the Weimar Court Theatre in 1802.⁵⁷ If Giuseppe Adami and Renato Simoni, the authors of *Turandot's* libretto, had not decided to change completely the text of the three riddles included in the story, we would now be able to listen to a riddle of AP 14 sung on the operatic stages of the twenty-first century.

⁵⁷ Gozzi: *L'albero, in cui la vita | d'ogni mortal si perde, | di vecchiezza infinita, | sempre novello, e verde, | che bianche ha le sue foglie | dall'una parte, e allegre; | bianchezza si discioglie; | son nel rovescio negre. | Stranier, di in cortesia | quest'albero qual sia* ('Stranger, please tell me which tree is much older than any human being and at the same time is always young and green, whose leaves are white and shining on one side and black on the other'). Schiller: *Der Baum, auf dem die Kinder | der Sterblichen verblühen, | steinalt, nichts desto minder | stets wieder jung und grün; | er kehrt auf einer Seite | die Blätter zu dem Licht; | doch kohlschwarz ist die zweite | und sieht die Sonne nicht. | Er setzt neue Ringe, | so oft er blühet, an. | Das Alter aller Dinge | zeigt er den Menschen an. | In seine grüne Rinden | drückt sich ein Name leicht, | der nicht mehr ist zu finden, wenn sie verdorrt und bleicht. | So sprich, kannst du's ergründen, | was diesem Baume gleicht?* ('There is a tree upon which the mortal lineage withers—an extremely old plant, and yet always young and green. Its leaves are full of light on one side but black as coal on the other, because this second side never sees the sun. Every time it blooms, it adds new rings, so as to show everybody the age of the world. It is very easy to carve a name in its green bark, but when this wooden shelter dries out and dies, you cannot read the name anymore. Tell me, can you find out what this tree stands for?'). For the other riddles used by Gozzi and Schiller in their own version of *Turandot's* story, see Beta (2016), 68–71; for the story of the fortune of the Persian tale, see E. Rossi (1956); Goldberg (1993).

Part 3

Writing Death

Death of a Child

Grief Beyond the Literary?

Richard Hunter

From Notion, the port of Colophon, there survives a well-known poem of imperial date on a three-year-old boy who drowned in a well:¹

ἡνίκα δ' ἡέλιος μὲν ἔδν πρὸς δώματα [.]
 δειπνήσας, ἦλθον μετὰ τοῦ μήτρω λο[έσας]θαι,
 κεῦθὺς με Μοῖραι προκαθίζανον εἰς φ[ρέ]αρ αὐτοῦ·
 ἔγδυνον γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἀπῆγέ με Μοῖρα κακίστη.
 χῶς εἶδεν δαίμων με κάτω, παρέδωκε Χ[άρ]ωνει·
 αὐτὰρ ὁ μήτρωσ μου ψόφον ἤκουσεν φρεατισμοῦ,
 κεῦθὺς μ' ἐζήτει γ' ἄρ'. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἐλπίδαν εἶχον
 ζωῆς τῆς κατ' ἔμμαντον ἐν ἀνθρώποισι μιγῆναι.
 ἔτρεχεν ἡ νάννη καὶ σχειρίζει τὸν γε χιτῶνα·
 ἔτρεχε κῆ μήτηρ καὶ ἴστατο ἥγε τυπητόν.
 κεῦθὺς Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πρὸς γούνατα πρόσπεσε νάννη,
 κοῦκ ἔτ' ἔμελλεν ἰδῶν, ἐνπήδα δ' εἰς φρέαρ εὐθύς.
 ὥς εὐρέν με κάτω βεβυθισμένον ἐξήνευ[κ]εν ἐ<ν> κοφίνῳ·
 κεῦθὺς δὴ νάννη με διάβροχον ἥρπασε θᾶσ<σ>ον,
 σκεπτομένη ζωῆς ἣ τιν' ἔχω μερίδα·
 ὦ δ' ἐμέ τὸν [δύσ]τηνον τὸν οὐκ ἐφιδόντα παλαίσ[τρα]ν,
 ἀλλ' ἤδη τριετῇ Μοῖρα [κάλ]υψε κακή.
 (GV 1159 = SGO 03/05/04)

When the sun had gone down to the halls [. . .],
 I came after dinner with my uncle to wash.
 At once the Fates sat me there on the well,

¹ I reproduce essentially the text of SGO and pass over in silence several textual and interpretative problems; I hope (and believe) that none of these problems has a significant bearing on the argument of this chapter.

for I fell in and a most hateful Fate took me away.
 When the *daimon* saw me below, he handed me over to Charon.
 But my uncle heard the sound of my falling into the well,
 and straightaway he went looking for me, but I no longer had any hope
 of mixing with men in my lifetime.
 My aunt ran up and tore her gown;
 my mother ran up and started beating her breast.
 Straightaway my aunt fell to embrace Alexander's knees,
 and when he saw this, he did not hesitate, but straightaway jumped into the well.
 When he found me down there drowned, he brought me out in a basket.
 Straightaway my aunt snatched my dripping body
 to see whether I had any share of life left.
 Alas for my wretched fate! I did not live to see the *palaistra*,
 but an evil Fate concealed me when I was just three years old.

This remarkably vivid poem offers serious problems of text and interpretation—the meaning of *προκαθίζων* in verse 3,² the related problem of *γάρ* in verse 4, the hypermetric verse 13,³ and so on—but the plainness of the colloquial language, the evocation of the voice and thought processes of a young child, and such stylistic effects as the anaphora of *ἔτρεχεν* (vv. 9–10) contained within a detailed narrative, which is both relatively lengthy and breathlessly swift, make this a text fully deserving of attention; it is virtually without close parallel in our corpus of sepulchral poetry.⁴

The language and versification of the Notion poem, as well as its remarkable narrative technique, offer the opportunity to consider the implications of the term 'literary', as it is applied to Hellenistic and later epigram and regularly denied to poetry that survives only on inscriptions. One feature of the Notion poem will strike any modern reader at once: the introduction of two pentameters at the end of the poem, which results in an elegiac rather than hexameter conclusion to the poem. The irregular mixing of hexameters and pentameters is a familiar feature of inscribed, particularly sepulchral, poetry, though

² *LSJ* s.v. *προκαθίζω* understands 'cause to sit down in', which makes some sense in the context and is essentially accepted by Merkelbach and Stauber (*SGO*); Vêrilhac (1978), 155 (cf. 1982, 113), however, translates *me firent tomber* ('made me fall'), which is harder to get from the ordinary usage of related verbs. Giambattista D'Alessio has suggested correcting *με* to *μοι*, but the author was presumably familiar with initial *μ*-lengthening the preceding syllable in Homer.

³ Peek (*GV*) suggested that *ἐ<ν> κοφίνῳ*, as read by Louis Robert, was in fact the start of a new verse, the rest of which has fallen out; Enrico Magnelli has noted the possibility that this lost verse was a pentameter, thus giving an ending to the poem (three distichs) that is even closer to that of Posidipp. *AP* 7.170 (see p. 142 here) than the text we possess.

⁴ Vêrilhac (1982), 113 describes this text as 'completely exceptional' (*tout à fait exceptionnel*). The closest parallel she can find is *GV* 1988 = *GG* 459, which mourns a family killed (apparently) when their house collapsed; the second part of that poem (or diptych) is spoken by the young boy who was killed, and he notes that the family went to sleep 'after the evening meal' (*μεταδόρπιον*). This poem is, however, very far from the Notion poem in terms of both style and narrative technique.

‘irregularity’ may not be the best way to describe the phenomenon. It appears early in the tradition,⁵ and from later epitaphs for children one may cite GV 684 (hex—pent—2 hex—pent), 734 (hex—pent—4 hex—pent), 745 (2 hex—pent—hex—pent—3 hex—pent—hex), 874 (= SGO 05/01/36), a poem for an eleven-year old boy who was killed in a fall from a tree (hex—pent—3 hex—pent—hex—pent—3 hex), 969 (= SGO 04/08/02, 2 hex—pent—hex—pent—2 hex—pent—2 hex), 1038 (3 hex—pent—2 hex), and 1270 (hex—pent—3 hex—pent—hex—pent). Two general points may be made here. In any given case, there may be a particular reason for a pattern of hexameters and pentameters, although this is an area where difference of opinion is almost inevitable. Thus, for example, GV 1331 = SGO 04/21/03 is a sepulchral epigram of the second century CE from Lydia:

ζητεῖς, ὦ παροδεῖτα, τίς ἡ στήλλη, τίς ὁ τύμβος.
 τίς δ' ἐν τῇ στήλλῃ εἰκὼν νεότευκτος ὑπάρχει·
 υἱὸς Τρύφωνος τοῦνομα τὰτὸν ἔχων·
 τεσσαρακαίδεκέτη δόλιχον βιότου σταδιεύσας
 τοῦθ' ὅ ποτε ὦν γέγονα· στήλλη, τύμβος, λίθος, εἰκὼν.
 (GV 1331 = SGO 04/21/03)

5

You wonder, passer-by, what is this stele, what is this tomb,
 whose is the newly crafted image on the stele?

The son of Tryphon, which is my name also.

I ran the race of life for fourteen years,
 and this is what I, who once existed, have become: a stele, a tomb, a stone,
 an image.

Here, I think, it is easy to believe that the central pentameter carries the essential message of this extraordinarily powerful poem—the deceased’s and his father’s name—whereas the surrounding pairs of hexameters respond to each other through the pathetic repetition of nouns between verses 1–2 and 4–5 and the fact that, though the passer-by will move on, Tryphon’s race is over: all movement, and indeed existence itself, has come to an end, and all that is left is ‘an image’.⁶ This case is a relatively simple one, but it also serves to remind us that, in the inscribed funerary poetry of the empire (and indeed before), it is the pentameter that is the ‘marked’ length, the hexameter being the default verse form. Hexameters may readily be multiplied, pentameters not; the process may be thought of as a kind of ‘extension’, which disturbs or expands the elegiac pattern but does not fundamentally destroy it. The rarity of pairs of

⁵ Cf. e.g. CEG 108, 171, 518, 524, etc.; Allen (1885–6), 52–5; Clairmont (1970), 51. Single pentameters regularly close a sequence of hexameters; cf. e.g. CEG 509, 543, 585, 704.

⁶ Comparable in some respects is a much earlier poem from Euboea, CEG 108, of the mid-fifth century BCE. In it two hexameters call the attention of passers-by to the key information—the deceased’s name and origin—contained in a following pentameter.

pentameters, let alone longer runs of stichic pentameters,⁷ at all periods of Greek verse makes the relation between hexameter and pentameter very clear; as the 'marked' length, the pentameter may also have a tendency to carry significant meaning. There is a further, related issue raised by the poem for Tryphon that cannot be pursued at any length here. The poem is inscribed on a stele that depicts Tryphon with his dog; the first two hexameters stand in the frame above the relief, but the pentameter and the start of the next hexameter encircle the top of the relief. The pentameter is thus prominently positioned near the representation (to aid with the identification of the deceased?), but is not otherwise marked out. The spatial relation between a poem and any image that accompanies it can never be left out of account in considering the pattern of the verses.⁸ I will return briefly to this question with regard to the Notion poem.

The pattern of hexameters and pentameters in inscribed poetry also raises the question of the relationship between such poetry and the 'literary' funerary epigrams composed by famous and not-so-famous poets from the high Hellenistic period onwards, which are very largely preserved for us in the manuscripts of the anthology tradition. Such 'literary' epigrams do not show irregularities in this matter: elegiac distichs follow each other with perfect regularity, as they also in fact do in the majority of inscribed epitaphs. The elimination of irregularities, if that indeed is what we are dealing with, may readily be understood as one further way in which an Asclepiades or a Meleager marked off their funerary epigrams from the poems actually inscribed on tombs. With regard to the metrical technique of 'literary' epigrammatists, Marco Fantuzzi and Alex Sens have written that they

adopt[ed] a style of versification that in and of itself distinguished their compositions from the poetry that was actually inscribed on tombs during their lifetimes... their verse-technique... seems to serve as a crucial 'sphragis' marking not only their literariness but also the difference between their compositions and the minor poetry, largely anonymous, of professional authors who composed for a diverse market.⁹

The inevitable regularity of the verse pattern may be one further marker of difference and of a sense, not just of specialness, but also of 'literary tradition':

⁷ Cf. GV 1805; Heliod. *Aeth.* 3.2.3–3.1. Reports of 'literary' poems ἐν πενταμέτρῳ (e.g. *Suda* π 248 on Panyassis) are usually (and surely rightly) understood as references to elegiac distichs, cf. Matthews (1974), 26–7. Single pentameters do appear as early epitaphs, cf. GV 928, CEG 176, 678 (with Hansen's note) and, for pairs of pentameters, cf. CEG 667, 689, 841; for pairs of pentameters sandwiched between hexameters, cf. CEG 171, 177 (ii), 518, 524, and for three pentameters after a hexameter, cf. CEG 82, 662, 715. SGO 01/12/17 (Halicarnassus, late Hellenistic) shows the pattern hex—pent—hex—2 × pent, the final pentameters carrying the central thrust of the message.

⁸ For the archaic and classical periods, see especially Clairmont (1970).

⁹ Fantuzzi and Sens (2006), 118.

a Mimnermus or a Theognis, too, surely never strayed from the regularity of the distich pattern.

When we return to the Notion poem, we note that the two pentameters come at the end and are closely bound to the hexameters that precede them; in other words, we may say that the poem concludes with two distichs. This may simply mark, as Valentina Garulli put it, *il recupero di uno stile più tradizionalmente epigrammatico*¹⁰ as the poem draws to a close, and there are certainly parallels for such a shift of versification at the end of a poem.¹¹ We might regard the Notion poem as effecting a kind of 'gliding transition' from narrative to 'epitaph proper', with verse 15, the first pentameter, bearing most of the weight of the transition. What is, however, most striking is how our recognition, halfway through verse 15, that we are suddenly reading a pentameter, not a hexameter, coincides with the aunt's recognition that the child is dead: ζωῆς is the hinge around which the poem turns, 'life' really on the edge. Nor is this the only poetic effect that points in this direction. If we exempt the final distich, the poem falls into two sections: the speaker's fate dominates the first (vv. 1–8), the reaction of those left behind the second (vv. 9–15); ζωῆς, or rather its negation, closes the first section and that closing, which is an ending in more ways than one, is poetically marked by the only example of enjambment between verses in the poem. The closing of the second section is then marked by another stylistic effect, namely the intrusion of pentameters, the rhythmical hallmark of an epitaph. Epitaphs are acknowledgements of death, of a finality from which there is no turning back, and they are, specifically, acknowledgements ('recognition', we might say) made by those who are left behind, even when the epitaph is made to speak, as the Notion poem does, in the deceased's voice. The child knew of, had 'recognized', his death (vv. 5, 7–8) long before those to whom he was dear did so; the dawning of the horrible truth upon those left behind is marked by the familiar consolation (or absence of it) offered by elegiac distichs, the epitaphic rhythm par excellence. 'Recognition' is a term also appropriate to the dramatic, theatrical quality of this narrative: the dead child is the audience of his own tragedy, for tragedy (for the living) may consist not in what happens but—as we and Oedipus know only too well—in discovering what has happened.

The feature of the Notion poem that has been most discussed is the fact that verse 15, the first pentameter, is a very lightly varied version of a verse from another poem, variously ascribed in the *Greek Anthology* to Posidippus and

¹⁰ Garulli (2012), 180 ('the recovery of a more traditionally epigrammatic style').

¹¹ In SGO 01/02/01 (third century BCE, Tymnos), a poem in five distichs explains the image of a snake on the tomb, and then two hexameters tell the passer-by where to look to see the deceased's name.

Callimachus, on the death of a three-year-old in a well, and verse 14 also seems to borrow directly from this same poem:

τὸν τριετῇ παίζοντα περὶ φρέαρ Ἀρχιάνακτα
 εἶδωλον μορφῆς κωφὸν ἐπεσπάσατο,
 ἐκ δ' ὕδατος τὸν παῖδα διάβροχον ἄρπασε μάτηρ
 σκεπτομένα ζωᾶς εἴ τινα μοῖραν ἔχει.
 Νύμφας δ' οὐκ ἐμίγηεν ὁ νήπιος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γούνοισι
 ματρὸς κοιμαθεὶς τὸν βαθὺν ὕπνον ἔχει.
 (Posidipp. AP 7.170 = HE 21 = 131 A–B)¹²

As the three-year old Archianax was playing around a well,
 the dumb image of his form drew him in.
 His mother snatched her dripping son from the water,
 wondering whether he still had any part of life.
 The child did not defile the Nymphs, but lying
 on his mother's knees he rests in deep sleep.

No doubt, many young children were in fact drowned in wells,¹³ and the citation of a verse (and more) from a (famous?) poem, or at least one believed to have been written by a famous poet, inscribes the death of our nameless child within a tradition in which that death may be somehow ennobled and memorialized. With the Notion poem, however, we are confronted on the stone with the shock of a death that is not something to be read about at a safe distance, in a book of poetry, but is rather a thing of vivid horror: not for this child and his parents the consolation and almost blessed relief of euphemism, 'deep sleep on his mother's knees' (which perhaps evokes, as has often been suggested, a sculptural image on a real or imagined stele),¹⁴ and piety, 'he did not defile the nymphs',¹⁵ but rather the inconsolable reality of a wet and wretched Fate, which did not allow him even to reach the age for the *palaistra*.¹⁶ Students of literary *uariatō* will note not only that the Notion poet has moved Posidippus' *τριετῇ* from the first verse to a perhaps more significant and pathetic position in the last one, but that the rewriting in verse

¹² I accept the now standard attribution, though I do not think that much hangs on it for my argument. I print the text of Austin and Bastianini (2002).

¹³ SGO 08/06/10 is an imperial epitaph from Hadrianouthera for a three-year-old who was apparently drowned at a bath (*Νυμφῶν παρὰ λουτροῖς*).

¹⁴ Cf. Gow and Page (1965), 2: 501 (= HE 3179); Vêrilhac (1978), 154. Callimachus all but explicitly acknowledges this euphemism in AP 7.451 = HE 1231–2: 'Here Saon from Acanthus, the son of Dicon, rests in holy sleep: say not that the good die'. GV 647 (imperial Rome) makes the same point and need not be a memory of Callimachus.

¹⁵ Piacenza (1998) offers an interesting discussion of the final couplet of Posidipp. AP 7.170, but it seems very improbable that the stress is on the fact that the mother's action in 'snatching' her child from the water deprived it of the immortality bestowed upon those taken by the nymphs. The principal point rather must be that the child did not 'defile' the nymphs by death in the well (cf. E. Hipp. 1437–8 with Barrett's note).

¹⁶ On this motif, see further, p. 152.

15, which uses the form *μερίς*, allows the poet to keep the form *μοῖρα* for a more significant role in his poem (vv. 3–4, 17).

Not everyone will interpret these phenomena as I just have. Anne-Marie Vérilhac, for example, sees the pentameters as simply a result of the poet's incompetent *imitatio*: 'The author, a mediocre versifier, could neither write a narrative in distichs nor disentangle himself sufficiently from his models to abandon the metre they had used.'¹⁷ More helpful, however, than such judgements may be to use the Notion poet's imitation of Posidippus to tease out distinctive features of both poems. Let me start with a striking feature of the Notion poem: we nowhere learn the dead child's name, and a glance through any collection of poems on this subject, such as that of Vérilhac (1978), will show how rare it is for such an epitaphic poem not to contain the deceased's name, even when the poem is cast as a first-person address by the dead. It is possible (just) that the name is concealed by corruption or textual loss, but it is much more likely that the name was either displayed separately on the tomb, physically separated from the poem (cf. e.g. GV 632, 1270, 1595, etc.),¹⁸ or even occurred in another poem (cf. GV 1988). The former possibility could be seen as an elaboration of a very early and common type of epitaph (e.g. GV 928–30, CEG 722), in which the deceased's name was displayed on one line, followed or preceded by a brief metrical epitaph.¹⁹ It is clear from the stone that we have the whole of the Notion poem,²⁰ but what accompanied it we cannot tell; we certainly cannot rule out the possibility that there was, for example, a representation of a child, and even a well. Nevertheless, the namelessness in the poem remains and tells its own story. We may see this as part of the surprisingly consistent *ethopoia* of the dead child's voice²¹—'this narrative concerns "me", and I do not use my own name when talking about myself'—but the namelessness is also of a piece with the inwardness of this bleak narrative: no passer-by is addressed, there is no protreptic 'cease your lamentations' addressed to the parents, and no overt suggestion that this poem is to offer the recompense of *kleos* away from the scene of death. The child's concentration on his own fate blots everything else out; the poem is anchored to a perpetual rerunning of terrible events where everyone who matters knows who everyone else is. Posidippus' poem, by contrast, is very different. As has

¹⁷ Vérilhac (1978), 156 (my translation).

¹⁸ GV 1595 is cited at p. 146. GV 1765 = SGO 05/01/64 (Smyrna, perhaps third century CE) is a first-person account, by a young boy, of how, after death from illness, he was carried to Olympus like Ganymedes; the poem does not record the boy's name or that of his parents, but the sixteen hexameters may not form the whole poem, and the names perhaps appeared either in the missing part or elsewhere on the tomb. See further Hunter (2018), 49–55.

¹⁹ Tsagalis (2008), 243–4, records that in some 78 per cent of fourth-century Attic funerary epitaphs the deceased's name occurs within the funerary poem itself; cf. also Clairmont (1970), 46–9.

²⁰ For a photograph of the stone, see Demangel and Laumonier (1923), 379.

²¹ See p. 152 in this chapter.

already been noted, the final verses of that poem in particular have often also been seen as epiphagic, that is, as associated with a representation of the dead child, but in this case the poem gives us the deceased's name, and the story is not freighted with the specificity and detail of the Notion poem; Posidippus' poem can be read anywhere, away from any particular monument, and the effect will be the same. The repeated 'mother' of verses 3 and 6 lends the poem a generalizing pathos, enhanced by the obvious allusion to the myth of Narcissus, and perhaps also to that of Hylas;²² Narcissus, at least, takes his place among images of the lost and untimely dead. Archianax's death thus follows a poetic and mythic pattern that, like the use of euphemism, removes some of the harsh reality of death by assimilating the dead to figures of story. No such consolations for the three-year-old, or his family, in the Notion poem.

Tradition, and specifically literary tradition, is, however, also central to the effect of the Notion poem. Whether we wish to look at the idea of 'death by water' quite generally or focus more narrowly on 'falling into a well', the sense of tradition in this poem is very strong. 'Falling into a well' can have its funny side, as the title *Into the Well* for a comedy of Alexis testifies.²³ A long sequence of Menander's *Dyskolos*, in which Cnemon has to be rescued from a well, shows a striking number of motifs shared with the Notion poem: the tough Gorgias plays the uncle's rescuing role (*Dys.* 670, 683–5)—they both act 'immediately', with no thought for personal safety—while Cnemon's daughter tears her hair and beats her breast, as do the women in the Notion poem.²⁴ The Notion poet and his audience will have met the motif in several places, in their readings in school, and (probably) also in the theatre. Closer in tone, however, to the child's story is Elpenor's narrative, in the *Odyssey*, of how, his wits befuddled with wine, he fell off Circe's roof:²⁵

ἀσέ με δαίμονος αἶσα κακὴ καὶ ἀθέσφατος οἶνος·
Κίρκης δ' ἐν μεγάρῳ καταλέγμενος οὐκ ἐνόησα
ἄφρονον καταβῆναι ἰὼν ἐς κλίμακα μακρὴν,
ἀλλὰ καταντικρὺ τέγεος πέσον· ἐκ δέ μοι αὐχὴν
ἀστραγάλων ἔαγη, ψυχὴ δ' Αἰδόοδε κατῆλθε.
(Hom. *Od.* 11.61–5)

The wretched fate of a *daimon* and too much wine brought ruin on me.
I was lying on Circe's roof and did not realize
that I should use the long ladder to come back down again.
I fell headlong from the roof; the bones of my neck
were broken and my spirit went down to Hades.

²² See Piacenza (1998), 348–9; pp. 146–7 in this chapter.

²³ For other comic scenes involving wells, see Arnott (1996), 229; and note Lucill. *AP* 11.137 = 46 Fl^b.

²⁴ It is noteworthy that the cook sees the nymphs as responsible for Cnemon's fate (v. 643): these are the nymphs of the well, exactly as in Posidipp. *AP* 7.170.

²⁵ I owe this parallel to Ivana Petrovic.

The δαίμονος αἶσα κακή that settled the young Elpenor's fate looks forward to the Notion child's tale of Μοῖρα κακίστη and a δαίμων,²⁶ and Elpenor's arrival in the Underworld seems just as swift as the child's. The Notion poet certainly knew Homer,²⁷ and the poem evokes literary scenes of high pathos.

Two passages of early epic had particular importance for subsequent epitaphic poetry, and both seem evoked by the Notion poem. A noise and a search are followed by the tearing of clothes and other signs of mourning, and we should be reminded of the opening of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (cf. vv. 20, 39, 41, 44, 57, 67, 81, etc.); even the child's almost instantaneous abandonment of hope in the Notion poem (v. 7) finds its counterpart in the *Hymn*, where Persephone still 'hopes', as long as she sees the familiar world around her (vv. 33–7). Persephone herself tells the story of how she was carried to the Underworld later in the poem, when she is reunited with her mother (vv. 406–33), and it is not unreasonable to see in that telling marks of an attempt to produce a subjective, perhaps even 'girlish', narrative that distinguishes itself from the narrator's initial narrative.²⁸ Here again, however, we note how bleak is the picture that the Notion poem paints: the child has no time even to cry out, and the sound that he leaves behind is simply the inarticulate noise (ψόφος) of falling into the well (v. 6). Death is always the 'snatcher': ἥρπαξεν in verse 3 of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (cf. v. 19) was to have a very long afterlife,²⁹ but we may note here how Posidippus and the Notion poet pathetically vary the motif by using the verb of an inevitably vain attempt to snatch a child from Death.

The importance of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and of the figure of Persephone in the epitaphic tradition is well known.³⁰ Persephone is the paradigmatic 'bride of Hades' whose rape, like the plucking of flowers in which she was engaged when Death snatched her, signifies the taking away of life before its due time; Demeter, in her turn, is the archetype of all grieving parents who are left behind, inconsolably bereft.³¹ The blending of event and image is already there in the archaic poem, as καλυκώπιδι, used of Persephone in verse 8, identifies the girl with the beautiful flowers that she picks, however exactly we wish to understand the epithet ('with buds in her eyes', perhaps); Hades' snatching of Persephone is the violent, male version of Persephone's celebration of the beauty of flowers. Persephone is, moreover, still very young, still—in Nicholas Richardson's words—'something of a child',³² and as such she is the

²⁶ On Elpenor's age, cf. *Od.* 10.552, νεώτατος.

²⁷ See p. 151 in this chapter.

²⁸ See e.g. Foley (1993), 60. The catalogue of Persephone's playmates in vv. 418–23, for example, may carry such a personal tone.

²⁹ Forms of ἀρπάζειν with Fate, Death, etc. as the subject are ubiquitous in sepulchral epigram; see e.g. VÉrilhac (1982), 174–80.

³⁰ See e.g. Tsagalis (2008), 100–10.

³¹ It is presumably just a coincidence that in the *Hymn* the goddess disguises herself as an old nurse and sits in grief beside a well, vv. 98–104.

³² Richardson (1974), note on v. 16.

model for all the untimely dead who follow her. A poem from Rome, perhaps roughly contemporary with the Notion poem, on a five-year-old girl who may also have drowned (note the Naiads in v. 10),³³ well illustrates this simple and powerful idea:

οὐχ ὁσίως ἤρπαξες ὑπὸ [χθόνα], κοίρανε Πλουτεῦ,
 πενταέτη νύμφην πᾶσιν ἀγαλλομένην·
 οἶα γὰρ ἀρχόμενον ῥόδον εὖπνοον εἶαρος ὥρη
 ἐξέτεμες ῥείζης, πρὶν χρόνον ἐκτελέσῃ.
 ἀλλ' ἄγ' Ἀλεξάνδρα καὶ Φίλτατε, μηκέτ' ὀδυρμοῖς
 εἰμερτῇ κούρῃ σπένδετε μυρόμενοι·
 εἶχεν γὰρ χάριν, εἶχεν ἐφ' ἥδυχρόοισι προσώποις,
 αἰθέρος ὥστε μένειν ἀθανάτοισι δόμοις.
 τοῖς πάρος οὖν μύθοις πιστεύσατε· παῖδα γὰρ ἐσθλὴν
 ἤρπασαν ὥς τερπνὴν Ναῖδες, οὐ Θάνατος.
 (GV 1595 = IGUR III 1344)

It was not right, lord Plouteus, to snatch away under [the earth]
 your five-year old bride, in whom all took delight.
 Like a young, sweet-smelling rose in springtime,
 you cut her off from the root, before her time had come.
 But come, Alexandra and Philtatos, no longer pour
 the libation of your tears in lamenting for your lovely daughter.
 She had grace, she had it in the sweet skin of her face,
 and so will dwell in the immortal houses in the sky.
 Believe too in the old myths. It was the Naiads, not Death,
 which snatched away the noble child to enjoy her.

Death's *νύμφη* is five years old; brides (or at least betrothed girls) of that age were anything but unknown in antiquity, but here there is a particular pathos, as the comparison to a budding rose in verses 3–4 very clearly continues the opening evocation of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. It is, however, probably not that poem but rather the story of Hylas—compare the Naiads of verse 10—that is evoked by the reference to ‘stories of former times’ in verse 9.³⁴ The connections between the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and the Hylas narratives of Theocritus and Apollonius, paradigmatic ‘deaths by water’, are both strong and direct,³⁵ and the story of Hylas was clearly part of the allusive repertoire of

³³ This is not certain, as the motif of being snatched by nymphs, or by a particular kind of nymph, is a common consolatory motif in epitaphs, cf. Moretti's commentary on IGUR III 1344; Cumont (1949), 325–6; Nock (1972), 924–5. GV 952 is the epitaph of a very young girl (‘not yet two’) who was snatched by *Νύμφαι κρηναῖαι* (did she drown?) but consoles herself with the thought that this was intended ‘perhaps to honour her’, *τάχα που τιμῆς εἵνεκα*.

³⁴ So e.g. Nock (1972), 924.

³⁵ See Hunter (1993), 40–1, citing earlier bibliography. It is relevant that, according to some versions, Hades and Persephone disappeared at a spring, or the god caused a spring to rise up at the point where he took his bride below the earth.

epitaphic poets.³⁶ One other motif, however, that calls attention to itself in this context is the idea that the Naiads took the child *ὡς τερπνὴν*, ‘as a source of pleasure’ (v. 10); the expression is awkward, and various emendations have been attempted (we might think rather of a noun, such as *τέρψιν* or *τέρπος*), but there is a consolatory rhetoric at work: the child who was a source of pleasure on earth is now performing that role elsewhere.

How this idea might play out can be seen on an imperial epitaph for a young boy from Syros:³⁷

[οὐ φατὸ]ν οὐδ' ἐπιέλπον ἔην κάλλος τε νόος τε
 [ἔμπεδ]ος ἡγορέη τ' ἐξαέτους βρέφους
 []ράτευσ, ὃν τίκτε γυνὴ καλή τε καὶ ἐσθλὴ
 [. . . ιο]ν, αἰδοίη Νικοκράτευσ ἄλοχος,
 [. . . το]ῦ κλέος εὐρὺ Πανέλληνσιν τε καὶ αὐτοῖς 5
 [Αἰνεά]δαις σοφίης εἵνεκεν ἧδ' ἀρετῆς.
 [πάτρη] δ' Ἀντιόχεια κλυτῆς ἀλόχοιο παρ' ὄχθαις
 [Μαιάνδ]ρου ποταμοῦ καλλινάου χθαμαλαῖς.
 [τοῦνε]κεν ἀρπάξας Ἐριούνιος Εὐβουλῇ
 [] ἄθυρμα φέρειν Φερσεφόνη τ' ἀλόχω, 10
 [] ἄχος λείπων πάππῳ μεγακυνδέϊ φωτὶ
 [. . .]ῳ πάτραις τ' ἧδὲ γονεῦσι φίλοις.
 (GV 2030 = IG XII.5.677)

[Not to be expressed] and beyond expectation was the beauty and
 intelligence and [steadfast] the courage of the six-year-old . . .
 whom a beautiful and noble woman bore . . .
 the reverend wife of Nicocrates . . .

[The father's] fame spread abroad to all the Greeks and to the very descendants
 of [Aeneas] because of his wisdom and virtue.
 The [home city] of his glorious wife was Antioch, beside the low-lying banks
 of the [Maeander] with its fair streams.

[For this reason] Eriunius snatched him up
 and brought . . . toy for Eubuleus and his wife Persephone,
 leaving . . . grief for his grandfather . . . , a man of great renown,
 and his homeland and his dear parents.

³⁶ Wypustek (2013), 165, claims that the Notion poem ‘refers to the tale of Hylas’; even if ‘evokes’ rather than ‘refers to’ is what is meant, it does not seem to me that there is enough there that explicitly calls Hylas to mind, even were we to see the uncle playing the role of Polyphemos in Apollonius’ narrative. Piacenza (1998), 348–9 sees a direct link between Theoc. *Id.* 13.53 and Posidipp. AP 7.170.5. GV 1732 = SGO 14/13/05 (from imperial Isaura in central Anatolia) compares the young Zenobius to ‘Hylas, the most outstanding of all heroes, who died in a spring, a wonder to the immortals’; there is, however, no necessary implication in that poem that Zenobius too was drowned. In v. 10 of GV 1595 = IGUR III 1344, Kamp (1875), 86 proposed ὥσπερ Ὑλαν for ὡς τερπνὴν.

³⁷ I adopt the standard restorations where nothing hangs on them for my argument.

Here the dead child is offered to Hades and Persephone as an ἄθυρμα, something that will perhaps appeal more to the girlish Persephone than to her husband. In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Persephone reaches for the deceitful narcissus as a καλὸν ἄθυρμα (v. 16), and perhaps in verse 10 of the Syros poem we should restore καλόν or τερπνόν, rather than Kaibel's almost universally accepted τέκνον;³⁸ this would leave ἀρπάξας (v. 9) without an object but would restore a familiar phrase and perhaps also a charged echo of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.

One further motif of which the Notion poem reminds us is that of the messenger who brings the report of death, or possible death, to those close to the victim. In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, we have the double role of Hecate and Helios, who slowly reveal the truth to the goddess, and we might also think of Apollonius' Hylas narrative, where Polyphemus brings the terrible news to Heracles (*Arg.* 1.1253–60). In the Notion poem, however, as in Theocritus' *Idyll* 13, there is no human being with any 'knowledge' who can mediate the tragic event to those left behind; the absence of a messenger, the sudden inexplicable disappearance of, or threat to, all that is dearest to one, is, as Theocritus realized in writing his Hylas narrative, a doubling of loss. In sepulchral epigram, of course, both 'literary' and 'non-literary', the messenger motif is widened beyond internal communication and made to play a dominant role in the dissemination of the message: the epigram now proclaims its message, or asks a passer-by to do so, to all the world. The motif runs all the way from 'Go tell the Spartans' ('Simon.' 22b *FGE*) to two of Callimachus' finest funerary epigrams, which ring very Callimachean changes upon the motif: 'Someone, Heraclitus, mentioned your death and it/he brought me to tears' (*AP* 7.80 = *HE* 1203–8) and 'If you go to Cyzicus... you will tell [Hippacus and Didyme] a painful report' (*AP* 7.521 = *HE* 1237–40).³⁹ Through the use of this motif, epigrams transcend the fixity of monumental inscription to encompass vast distances,⁴⁰ but—as I have already noted—such spatial consolation is denied to the drowned child of the Notion poem. In its place the whole poem has become a kind of messenger speech, beginning with an indication of time, as messenger speeches in tragedy often do, and bringing news of a sad death, again as tragic messenger speeches so often do. The abrupt, if stylistically elaborate,⁴¹ beginning of the narrative, with its refusal of all the normal epitaphic conventions, forces our attention upon its generic form. What gives this messenger speech such power is, of course, that the

³⁸ Peek (*GV*) restored [αὐτόν].

³⁹ For other aspects of Call. *AP* 7.521, cf. Walsh (1991), 91–2; Hunter (2003), 478. Tarán (1979), 132–49 discusses the messenger motif in several 'literary' Hellenistic epigrams; cf. also Bing (2009), 131–2.

⁴⁰ There is here clearly a contrast to be drawn with 'literary' epigrams, which did indeed circulate freely in book form; cf. Bing (2009), 141–2.

⁴¹ See p. 151 in this chapter.

messenger is reporting his own death, whereas the messengers of tragedy, though often moved to tears by what they have to report, are essentially separated from the events of their narrative: it is the suffering of others that takes centre stage.

A link has often been drawn between the narrative of the first part of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and the sequence in *Iliad* 22 in which Andromache comes to learn of Hector's death:⁴²

ἄλοχος δ' οὐ πώ τι πέπυστο
 Ἕκτορος· οὐ γάρ οἱ τις ἐτήτυμος ἄγγελος ἔλθων
 ἡγγεῖλ', ὅττι ῥά οἱ πόσις ἔκτοθι μίμνε πυλάων,
 ἀλλ' ἣ γ' ἰστὸν ὕφαινε μυχῶ δόμου ὑψηλοῖο 440
 δίπλακα πορφυρέην, ἐν δὲ θρόνα ποικίλ' ἔπασσεν.
 κέκλετο δ' ἀμφιπόλοισιν ἐὺπλοκάμοις κατὰ δῶμα
 ἀμφὶ πυρὶ στήσαι τρίποδα μέγαν, ὅφρα πέλοιτο
 Ἕκτορι θερμὰ λοετρὰ μάχης ἔκ νοστήσαντι·
 νηπίη, οὐδ' ἐνόησεν, ὅ μιν μάλα τῆλε λοετρῶν 445
 χερσ' ὑπ' Ἀχιλλῆος δάμασε γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη.
 κωκυτοῦ δ' ἤκουσε καὶ οἰμωγῆς ἀπὸ πύργου·
 τῆς δ' ἐλελίχθη γυνία, χαμαὶ δέ οἱ ἔκπεσε κερκίς.
 ἣ δ' αὖτις δμωῆσιν ἐὺπλοκάμοισι μετηνύδα·
 'δεῦτε, δύω μοι ἔπεσθον· ἴδωμ' ὅτιν' ἔργα τέτυκται. 450
 αἰδοίης ἐκυρῆς ὁπὸς ἔκλυνον, ἐν δέ μοι αὐτῇ
 στήθεσι πάλλεται ἡτορ ἀνὰ στόμα, νέρθε δὲ γούνα
 πήγνυται· ἐγγὺς δὴ τι κακὸν Πριάμοιο τέκεσσιν.
 αἶ γὰρ ἀπ' οὐατος εἴη ἐμεῦ ἔπος, ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἰνῶς
 δείδω, μὴ δὴ μοι θρασὺν Ἕκτορα διὸς Ἀχιλλεὺς 455
 μούνον ἀποτμήξας πόλιος πεδίονδε δίηται,
 καὶ δὴ μιν καταπαύσῃ ἀγνωρίης ἀλεγεινῆς
 ἣ μιν ἔχεσκέ, ἐπεὶ οὐ ποτ' ἐνὶ πληθυὶ μένεν ἀνδρῶν,
 ἀλλὰ πολὺ προθέεσκε, τὸ ὄν μένος οὐδενὶ εἴκων·'
 ὥς φαμένη μεγάραιο διέσσυτο μαινάδι ἴση,
 παλλομένη κραδίην· ἅμα δ' ἀμφίπολοι κίον αὐτῇ.
 (Hom. Il. 22.437–61)

Hector's wife had not yet learned anything,
 for no truthful messenger had come to report to her
 that her husband had remained outside the gates.
 In the recesses of the lofty dwelling she was weaving
 a purple double-cloak, inset with colourful flowers,
 and she had told her lovely tressed maidservants in the house
 to set a great tripod on the fire so that there would be
 hot water for Hector's bath when he returned from the fighting.
 Poor woman: she did not know that, far from his bath,
 bright-eyed Athena had killed him through the hands of Achilles.

⁴² See Richardson (1974), 161.

She heard the wailing and lamentation from the tower;
 her limbs quaked, and her shuttle fell to the ground.
 Again she called to her lovely tressed maids:
 'Come, two of you follow me. I must see what has happened.
 I heard the voice of my reverend mother-in-law, and my heart inside
 my chest leaps to my mouth and below my limbs
 are frozen. Some evil hangs over the children of Priam!
 May such a thing as I say never reach my ears, but I am very much
 afraid lest godlike Achilles may have cut off bold Hector
 away from the city and be pursuing him over the plain.
 Achilles would put an end to that grievous impetuosity
 of Hector's, for he never remained with the mass of soldiers
 but always ran out in front. His spirit took second place to no one.'
 With these words she rushed through the hall like a maenad,
 her heart pounding; her maids went with her.

Andromache is in apparently blissful ignorance, 'for no truth-telling messenger had come to her' (cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 44–6). Verses 438–9 seem to reflect what would have been a familiar epic-type scene,⁴³ and the poet thus draws our attention to what is striking and powerful in this moment of emotional contrast: Andromache had been spared the anguish of knowing that Hector was to face Achilles, only to find that this ignorance was to exact a terrible price. The Homeric narrative technique by which Andromache's hearing of the lamentation on the tower and her rushing off 'like a maenad'⁴⁴ are separated by a ten-verse speech of foreboding to her maidservants is a remarkable manifestation of the stylization of high epic narrative; such a form, which to some extent represents in speech Andromache's unarticulated, internal fears, has of course no counterpart in the narrative of the Notion poem, though—were this a more extended narrative form—it would be easy enough to imagine one placed in the uncle's mouth after verse 6. As with Andromache, it is a noise that draws the attention of those nearest to the deceased; for Homer's concern with narrative tension and the revelation of character through speech, the Notion poem has substituted a breathlessly fast narrative, which wonderfully catches the panic of the moment. It is in details such as this one that we understand the compression and extension of different narrative forms, or rather perhaps we catch one of the essences of Homer's art.

The death narrative that the Notion poet has created for the three-year-old victim resonates, then, not just with the high art of a Posidippus (or

⁴³ See further, de Jong (2012) on vv. 438–9.

⁴⁴ At *Ov. Fast.* 4.457–8 Ceres is compared to a maenad, as she takes off in search of her daughter; Ovid has excellent Roman models here (see the commentators *ad loc.*), but the possibility that he is connecting Andromache in *Iliad* 22 with the distraught goddess should at least be raised.

Callimachus), but with the two narratives that had the greatest influence on all Greek epitaphic poetry, namely the death of Hector and the rape of Persephone. The general stylistic level of the poem's diction is, however, (in conventional terms) low, unadorned, and 'prosaic': terms such as *φρεατισμός* and *τυπητός*⁴⁵ will probably not turn up again in inscribed epitaphs (and may also be thought to be somewhat unlikely in the mouth of a three-year-old).⁴⁶ Homeric touches, on the other hand, frame the narrative in such a way as to suggest poetic design.⁴⁷ The opening verse is fashioned after the Homeric sequence *ἥμος δ' ἥελιος κατέδυ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθεν* ('when the sun went down and darkness came', used once in the *Iliad*, six times in the *Odyssey*),⁴⁸ and the child's exclamation in the final hexameter picks up the Homeric phrase *ἐμὲ τὸν δύστηνον* (cf. *Od.* 7.223, 248, *Il.* 22.59). The poet might indeed have in mind this final instance, from Priam's doomed appeal to Hector:

πρὸς δ' ἐμὲ τὸν δύστηνον ἔτι φρονέοντ' ἐλέησον,
 δύσμορον, ὃν ῥα πατήρ Κρονίδης ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδᾶ
 αἴσῃ ἐν ἀργαλέῃ φθείσει, κακὰ πόλλ' ἐπιδόντα,
 υἱᾶς τ' ὀλλυμένους ἐκκηθείσας τε θύγατρας
 καὶ θαλάμους κεραϊζομένους, καὶ νήπια τέκνα
 βαλλόμενα προτὶ γαίῃ ἐν αἰνῇ δῆϊοτήτι,
 ἐλκομένας τε νουὺς δλοῆς ὑπὸ χερσὶν Ἀχαιῶν. 60
 (Hom. *Il.* 22.59–65)

Moreover, pity me in my wretchedness while I still have my senses,
 an ill-fated man whom father Zeus will destroy with a grim
 fate on the threshold which is old age. I have lived to see many horrors,
 my sons killed, my daughters dragged off,
 my chambers looted, helpless children
 thrown to the ground in the terror of war,
 and my daughters-in-law dragged off by the cruel hands of the Achaeans.

An echo of this early moment in the story of the death of Hector in any poem about the death of a child, even a very young child, would be obviously

⁴⁵ The form is presumably *metri gratia*; *τυπητός* is found once in Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

⁴⁶ Peek (1932), 240 offers a very harsh judgement of the poem's style ('beyond repair', *ganz hilflos*).

⁴⁷ On reminiscences of Homer in inscribed epigram, Thonemann (2014) is an instructive essay; cf. also Bing (2009), chapter 8; Hunter (2018), chapter 1. Marked differences of levels of diction within a poem are also a familiar feature of inscribed epigram. Among the more striking examples, and of some interest in the context of SGO 03/05/04, is GV 874 = SGO 05/01/36, a late Hellenistic or early imperial funerary epigram for an eleven-year-old boy who fell out of a tree and broke his neck: as he died 'he drenched his father's lap with the wetness of the blood of his piteous death' (*πατρός κόλπους ἐνιδεύσας | αἵματος οἰκτροφόνου ψυχολιπῆς νοτίσιν*), an image that inevitably recalls passages such as A. Ag. 1389–90 and S. Ant. 1238–9; *οἰκτροφόνου* is an absolute *hapax legomenon* in extant Greek.

⁴⁸ Peek (1932), 239, claims that the initial *δέ* (with *μέν* following) shows that the verse is actually copied from an epic poem, but such weight should not be attached to what may be a simple fusion of two Homeric snippets.

appropriate, and it may be the memory of this scene that suggested the choice of *ἐφιδόντα* in verse 16 (compare *Iliad* 22.61), where we might have expected the future tense.⁴⁹ Some might think that the contrast between the aged Priam's lament and the child's regret at 'not having seen the *palaistra*' verges on the bathetic, but Homeric memory is here used, as so often, to lend depth and resonance to a moment of pathos; the 'helpless child' of the Notion inscription has fallen 'to the earth' in the most terrible way. The poeticism of the opening verse announces the drama and horror of what is to follow.

The grief of those left behind is immortalized time and again on countless Greek epitaphs, but we will not find many three-year-old children delivering relatively extensive narratives.⁵⁰ Posidippus *AP* 7.170, for example, is in the third person, and the dead child, literally *νήπιος*, 'without a voice', plays, dies, and sleeps with no more sound than the 'dumb image' that led him on to his death. Noiselessness is a constitutive feature of the art of the epigram: even Archianax's mother pulls him from the water without lamentation, and now he sleeps deeply, forever embalmed in stone. The Notion poet, however, has given his child a voice—and one characterized, for the most part, by the kind of language and concerns we associate with children: dinner, family (*ὁ μῆτρως μου, ἡ νάννη, ἡ μήτηρ*),⁵¹ the emphatic superlative *κακίστη* in verse 4,⁵² the regret for the *palaistra*, that earthly nirvana on which any young boy set his heart from a very early age.⁵³ So, too, the unelaborated nature of the narrative,

⁴⁹ For the meaning 'live to see', cf. *LSJ* s.v. *ἐπεῖδον* 3. Unsurprisingly, the exegetical scholia on these Homeric verses see here not just a foreshadowing of the sack of Troy but, specifically, the origin of the tragic treatments of Cassandra and Astyanax; the latter was thrown by the Greeks off the battlements of Troy. Giacomo Fedeli suggests to me that the story of Astyanax, who had a (paternal) uncle called Alexander, is relevant to the Notion poem; at *E. Tr.* 1188–91, Hecuba bitterly imagines what might be written on his epitaph.

⁵⁰ The closest analogue is perhaps *IGUR* IV 1702, a third-century CE account by a four-year-old boy of how a succession of medical conditions finally brought about his death. *GV* 1155 = *GG* 167, a Hellenistic poem from Amorgos, tells of the death of a sixteen-year-old from a javelin in the gymnasium; it becomes clear in the final four distichs that the poem is spoken by the deceased, though the first twelve verses give no hint of that. *AP* 7.334 = *SGO* 08/01/41 is a poem in nine distichs in which a boy who died before shaving his first beard laments the grief his death caused to his mother; he does not explain how he died, though there is a narrative element in the fact that his father 'abandoned me as an orphan in their house when [I] was very small' (vv. 7–8). *GV* 1350 = *SGO* 07/06/05, an imperial-age poem from Ilion, is a first-person address by a boy who died old enough to have learned the trade of a barber; most of the poem concerns his parents' grief, but there is also a very mysterious narrative element: 'From behind a hand cast wretched me into Hades and within two weeks I departed from life'. On *GV* 1765 = *SGO* 05/01/64, see n. 18 in this chapter.

⁵¹ We do not have to be told explicitly who Alexander (v. 11) is: the child knows, and that is sufficient. The use of the proper name in that verse is perhaps intended to mimic the women shouting his name. The prominence given to the uncle, if indeed 'Alexander' is the uncle, is in fact one of the puzzling features of the poem; was the child's father already dead? Others have suggested that 'Alexander' is in fact the child's father or a family slave.

⁵² In *IGUR* IV 1702 (see n. 50 here) one of the child's conditions is a *νόσος κακίστη* (v. 20).

⁵³ Entry to the *palaistra* or gymnasium might be almost as much of a landmark as marriage was for girls, see *GV* 119; Vêrilhac (1982), 51–2.

its breathless verbal pace, the syntactic completeness of most hexameters that eschew enjambment,⁵⁴ and the presentation of the child as a passive object of forces beyond his control are clearly also part of a persistent, though perhaps variably successful, attempt in the main body of the narrative to characterize the voice that the poet has created. This three-year-old's narrative, however, is also characterized by poetic reminiscence and the construction of a 'literary' narrative of events of which the dead child cannot possibly have known. We may, if we wish, say that this is a sequence of events that the child will have wished to have happened, one constructed for him by the poet out of familiar scenes, and one that absolves his uncle of any blame for the death; this familiarity and literariness carries its own (cold?) consolation in memorialization and assimilation to famous forebears. The *Notion* poem fills in the terrible silences of Posidippus *AP* 7.170, thus drawing both poems into the web of tradition.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to audiences in Cambridge, Chicago, Dublin, London, and Venice for much stimulating discussion and to the editors of this volume for their help. All translations are my own, unless otherwise stated.

⁵⁴ Cf. p. 141 on vv. 7–8.

Hellenistic and Roman Military Epitaphs on Stone and on Papyrus

Questions of Authorship and Literariness

Silvia Barbantani

1. INTRODUCTION: THE QUEST FOR *KLEOS*

Celebration of military *arete* has been at the core of Hellenic culture and a common topic for dactylic poetry since Homer. The tomb (*sema*) is seen as bestowing ἄσβεστον κλέος ('immortal fame'),¹ but it is understood that a monumental grave alone is not enough for the memory of heroic deeds to survive. Poetry is the only way not only to perpetuate glory through time but also to spread it across space—an ability that monuments do not possess, as Pindar aptly reminds his patrons in the well-known opening of *Nemean* 5. Promises of promotion to heroic status through poetry are reinvigorated in the Hellenistic period with the development of the book culture, so that (to continue the Pindaric metaphor) not only memorized poetry can board a ship (see Plu. *Nic.* 29) and travel throughout the Greek-speaking world but papyrus rolls can do it, too, reaching as far as the extreme boundaries of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic empires.

Hellenistic kings and their *philoï* certainly did not have a shortage of personal 'Homers' to elevate their deeds into heroic fantasy. Theocritus (*Id.* 16.42–59), for example, presents himself to his potential royal patrons as the new Homer and the new Simonides.² Ambition for fame after death, however, was never the exclusive prerogative of royalty; simple soldiers or middle-class officers could satisfy their ambitions too, only in a more modest way. They could not hope for an epic poem to commemorate their *res gestae* but, at most, for a short epitaph commissioned by their family or brothers in

¹ *Od.* 4.583–4, 24.83–4; *Il.* 16.454–7. See Ecker (1990), 34–40 and 189–94.

² See Giommoni's chapter in this volume.

arms. The very existence of an individual tombstone hinted at the deceased's social status. In antiquity, most of the foot soldiers were buried where they fell; mass graves (*polyandria*) were provided with epitaphs commissioned at public expense. Even though Theocritus (*Id.* 16.42–59) does not refer to 'epigram' as a medium for praise, he mentions Simonides as his predecessor (having in mind, most likely, the latter's longer elegies—such as the one for Plataea). During Theocritus' life the so-called *Sylloge Simonidea*, or at least a collection of famous military epitaphs composed by Simonides, was already circulating on papyrus and offered a model for 'epic' praise of the dead in a condensed, inscriptional form.³

In the modern world, the standard epitaph for a soldier in a war cemetery records just a few basic anagraphic data. Likewise, in antiquity the vast majority of epitaphs consisted of just a few words, not necessarily in metrical arrangement, that registered the main biographical data. Individual epitaphs for men who fell in battle are already common in the archaic and classical periods, but in the Hellenistic era they multiply in every geographical area conquered by Alexander. Their typology becomes more varied and complex between the third century BCE and the end of the Roman empire, even though their main purpose remains the same: to act like a miniature epic poem (most often in elegiacs), praising the deceased and contributing to the survival of his fame, as stated with poignant simplicity by Anyte (*AP* 7.724.3–4 = *HE* 4.3–4): ἀλλὰ καλὸν τοι ὑπερθεῖν ἔπος τόδε πέτρος αἰεῖδει, | ὥς ἔθανες πρὸ φίλας μαρνάμενος πατρίδος ('but the stone above you sings this beautiful poem, how you died fighting for your dear homeland').⁴ In spite of Anyte's wish, however, after the fourth century BCE the epitaph for individual soldiers never became very popular among the compilers of literary anthologies, nor did it spawn a purely literary subgenre; the *kleos* commemorated by the epitaphs apparently did not fare so well in the literary tradition as their commissioners had probably expected.

Ideally, epitaphs celebrating deaths—and lives spent—in battle are expected to show a higher literary quality and more frequent references to Homer and other champions of martial poetry (mainly Tyrtaeus)⁵ than epitaphs for other professional categories (with the notable exception of poets). Even when the versifier is not particularly good, this disappointing reality does not erase the idea that the epitaph is, nonetheless, a form of mini-epos capable of immortalizing the deceased: for example, in addition to other statements on the survival of *kleos*, the Homeric formula καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι ('so that even future generations would know') resurfaces in epitaphs in the most diverse

³ See Page (1981), 122–3; Bravi (2006); A. Petrovic (2007b); Sider (2007); Kaczko (2009), 110–13.

⁴ The translations are my own, unless otherwise stated.

⁵ Universally present in military epitaphs is the Homeric and Tyrtaean topos of death in the front line of the battlefield; see Barbantani (2014), 321–2.

areas of the Roman empire.⁶ Countless are the Homeric allusions in military epitaphs of every period.⁷ I point out a very peculiar case, which shows how Homeric reminiscences are included not just when concepts related to the heroic *ethos* are presented, but also when the epitaph focuses on a more intimate sphere (SGO IV 22/49/01).⁸ This epitaph is a good example of the *pietas* (and also of the literary ambitions) that a soldier's family could show in relation to his burial. Composed for a Syrian soldier deceased in Egypt, it states that his body was granted a tomb in his own country, while the corpses of his fellow soldiers did not enjoy the same care:

Αἴγυπτος στυγερὴ ψυχὰς ὤλεσε σύν σεο πολλάς,
ἀλλὰ σ' {ενι} ἐνκτερέϊξε θῖος καὶ πότνια μήτηρ,
κείνους δ' οὔτις· οἰωνοῖσι δὲ κύρμ' ἐγένοντο.
θάρει

(SGO IV 22/49/01)

Odious Egypt destroyed together with you many souls,
but you were granted funerary honours by your uncle and venerable mother;
they, by nobody. They became pray for birds.
Be of good courage!

The expression in verse 3 is reminiscent of the *incipit* of the *Iliad*, especially of verses 3–4—*αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν | οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι* ('[he] made them pray to dogs and to all birds')—but also of a recurrent Homeric formula that appears for instance at *Iliad* 5.488: *ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένησθε* ('[beware lest] you become prey and booty for the enemies').⁹ *Πότνια μήτηρ* (v. 2) is also a Homeric formula (e.g. *Il.* 1.357, 6.413). 'Odious Egypt' (v. 1) recalls the 'odious wars' of *Iliad* 4.240 and 6.330, for example, and appears in some military epitaphs (see e.g. *IG* IX.1, 1064.1–2, *στυγεράων . . . πολέμων*, 'hateful . . . wars', from Anticyra, 278 BCE).¹⁰ In contrast to the familiar forms used in epic style, the verb *ἐνκτερέϊξε* here (v. 2) is rare.¹¹

Additionally, the reprises of ancient poets are not always predictable: in Hellenistic inscriptional epitaphs we also find surprising allusions to more

⁶ *Il.* 22.305–6 (cf. *Il.* 6.357–9, *Od.* 24.93–4); see Kaibel (1878), 527.5–6 (Beroia, third century CE?); *IK Klaudiupolis* 78.4; *KILyk.* I 306 (Lycaonia, Lystra) = *GV* 569.18. For further examples, see Barbantani (forthcoming).

⁷ See Derderian (2001), 89–91. On the influence of poets on professional versifiers of inscribed epigrams, see Garulli (2012), 379–82; Tsagalis (2008), 262–76.

⁸ Meimaris and Makrygianni (2008), no. 59. The exact *Fundort* ('location of its finding') is unknown. Seyrig (1954), no. 2, contextualizes the death of this soldier during an attack by Septimius Zabdas, a general of Queen Zenobia of Palmyra, against Egypt in 271 CE. For emotions in epigram, see Meyer's chapter in this volume.

⁹ Cf. *Il.* 17.151, 17.272–3; *Od.* 3.271, 5.473, and 15.480.

¹⁰ Pappadakis (1920–1), 144; Lattimore (1942), 240 remarks that this is one of the few military epitaphs expressing grief. See Meyer's chapter in this volume.

¹¹ Cf. *IG* XII.5 308 (Paros) = *Anth. Graec. Appendix, Ep. sepulcralia*, 1.394; *IGUR* III, 1149.7–8 (fourth century CE); Leon. *AP* 7.163.3 = *HE* 70.3; *A.R. Argon.* 2.857.

recent ‘classics’. In the epitaph for Pantarchus,¹² a Roman soldier from Sebastoupolis, the first two verses (ὄλβ[ι]ος ὃν μοῖραι πανδερκέες ἐ[κπερώωντα] | [νῆ]δύος ἀθρήσῳσι γαληναίησι[ν ὀπωπαῖς], ‘Blessed is the one whom the all-seeing Moirae looked at with serene eyes when he came out of the womb!’) possibly echo the Prologue of Callimachus’ *Aetia* (fr. 1.37–8 Pf.). Moreover, a vague Callimachean allusion (ἵππων καὶ σακέων ἀδομένα πατάγω, ‘cherishing the noise of the horses and of the shields’, *Hymn* 5.44) has been recognized in a war epitaph by Diotimus (AP 7.227.2 = HE 2.2), the exclusively literary nature of which is disputed.¹³

2. FROM STONE TO THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY: THE EXTRAORDINARY CASE OF SOTERICHUS

The Homeric presence in inscriptional epitaphs does not consist only in the use of epic style and formulae. From the Hellenistic period onwards, the comparison, either allusive or overt, between soldiers and Homeric heroes becomes more frequent, especially in correspondence with the mythological revival of the Second Sophistic. The examples of epigraphic poems that compare the deceased to a Homeric hero are numerous.¹⁴ Surprisingly enough, however, the only epitaph of this kind that has survived in a literary collection is an anonymous one, composed in hexameters for a soldier named Soterichus, who compares himself to Nestor:

πληρώσας στρατιὴν Σωτήριχος ἐνθάδε κείμει,
ὄλβον ἐμῶν καμάτων γλυκεροῖς τεκέεσσιν ἑάσας.
ἦρξα δ’ ἐν ἱππῆεσσι, Γερήνιος οἶά τε Νέστωρ,
ἐξ ἀδίκων τε πόνων κειμήλιον οὐδὲν ἔτευξα.
τοῦνεκα καὶ μετὰ πότμον ὄρω φάος Οὐλύμποιο.
(anon. AP 7.678)

Having accomplished my military service, I, Soterichus, lie here,
leaving to my sweet children the wealth I gained by my labours.
I was commander in the cavalry, like Gerenian Nestor,
and I never amassed any treasure from unjust actions.
Therefore after death too I see the light of Olympus.¹⁵

¹² SGO II 11/13/02 (fourth–fifth century CE?). See Le Guen-Pollet (1989), 72–4, no. 16; Mitford (1991), 215–17, no. 22. Marek (1993), 217 dates it to the second century CE. Being ὄλβιος is a condition frequently mentioned in epitaphs for soldiers who survived and thrived in old age (see p. 158 and n. 17 in this chapter).

¹³ Since the epigram does not seem to mention the deceased’s homeland, it is considered to be inscriptional by Waltz (2002) and by Gow and Page (1965), 2: 273; see p. 164 in this chapter.

¹⁴ E.g. GV 689, 1521, 1733, 1804, 1811; SGO IV 17/17/01. See Barbantani (2016).

¹⁵ Text edited and translated by Paton (1916–18), 2: 360–1.

The poem, probably late Hellenistic or imperial (Soterichus is a common name that occurs mostly in Roman times),¹⁶ is placed in a mixed section of the seventh Book of the *Greek Anthology*, along with some Simonidean epitaphs (the previous one, AP 7.677, is for Megistias). One of these (the following one, AP 7.679, sixth century CE) is composed by the Patriarch Sophronius, some by Leonidas of Alexandria, and others by Palladas. The epitaph, which is not particularly outstanding as a literary piece, undoubtedly was picked out for its gnomic value and for the mention of Nestor, to whom a fictitious epitaph in the *Greek Anthology* (AP 7.144) is devoted. The comparison with Homeric heroes such as Achilles or Ajax is frequent in military epitaphs; but the association with Nestor, which underlines Soterichus' successful long service as a cavalry commander, is quite original. The poem exhibits some recurrent features encountered in similar inscriptional poems for soldiers of the Roman empire, especially from the Hellenized East, such as the remark that Soterichus has completed the *militia* and takes pride in having enriched his family through a tiring and engaging job (ὄλβος in v. 2 is a keyword in Hellenistic poetry on the theme of the *tryphe* of monarchs blessed by the gods).¹⁷ Thus it is very likely that the epigram was composed for a real grave.

This case study shows that from the mere content and literary quality of the verses it is difficult to distinguish a literary epitaph from an inscribed one. There is also no reason to think that in the Hellenistic period the so-called literary epigrammatists could not have also accepted commissions for inscriptions, as Simonides did. However, recent studies have noticed that the two 'species' have a tendency to diverge in length: especially from the first century BCE onwards inscriptional epitaphs become longer, while the literary epigrams tend to maintain an average length of four verses, that is, two elegiac couplets.¹⁸ In the field of military epitaphs, literary pieces from the *Greek Anthology* (Damagetus, Antipater of Sidon) are three couplets long at most, although those attributed to Posidippus may be longer. In some rare cases, mainly from Egypt and Asia Minor, the inscribed epitaphs are in fact long elegies that contain a biographical narrative.¹⁹ Ewen Bowie has discussed the possible influence of symposiastic, narrative, and exhortatory elegy on epigram already during the fourth century BCE.²⁰ From the third century BCE to the third century CE, we can count at least forty-nine long funerary

¹⁶ It is not necessary to identify him with the renowned *praefectus praetorii* of the fifth century CE. *LGPV* lists at least 322 occurrences of the name Σωτήριχος.

¹⁷ The theme of *tryphe* ('luxury') acquired in life is present in some 'Sardanapalic' epitaphs such as SGO IV 21/06/01 (Tiberias, third century CE); cf. SGO III 16/04/04 (Apamea Cibotus, third century CE).

¹⁸ For the interrelation between literary and inscriptional epigrams, see the chapters by Day, Demeo, and Hunter in this volume.

¹⁹ Barbantani (2014).

²⁰ Bowie (2010).

epitaphs, mostly for wealthy and prominent clients.²¹ From the first century CE literary epigrams seem to privilege *brevitas*, while inscriptional ones become quite long and elaborate,²² even though short epitaphs for people who could not afford to pay for long-winded poems are still a very popular item. Some interesting epitaphs preserving biographies of their *laudandi* are structured as diptychs, illustrating the deceased's activities in war and peace: two relevant examples are the Hellenistic epitaph of Charmadas (SGO IV 21/05/01, Gaza, c.201 BCE) and the imperial epitaph of Priscus (SGO IV 10/02/28, Caesarea-Hadrianoupolis, Paphlagonia, early second century CE).²³

3. INDIVIDUAL EPITAPHS: AUTHORSHIP AND COMMISSION

Who were the authors of such epitaphs? Is there any relation between the world of private inscriptional commissions and that of literary *paignia*? It has been suggested that the deceased, especially when he presents himself as a veteran belonging to the local élite, may have had his say on the content and form of his future epitaph, or even been responsible for composing it. According to Christian Marek, this is possibly the case for the ambitious Priscus mentioned in the preceding section: his epitaph, which presents him as an Achilles in war turned into a Laertes after his retirement, is inspired by both Homer and Hesiod and is extraordinary in length and elaboration, although the poem is far from being a poetic masterpiece.²⁴ Other cases of cultivated amateurs who wrote their own epitaphs, with uneven results, are known.²⁵ Most of the citizens who died in battle and were commemorated with an individual epitaph, in *poleis* of the classical as well as of the Hellenistic era, were recipients of a thorough gymnasial education, as were their parents; most probably their relatives, friends, and teachers could compose an epitaph for them. A remarkable funerary poem mentions in the same breath the *barbiton* and the verses of Homer as the tools of the athletic and military education of a prematurely deceased youth from Aphrodisias.²⁶ In many cases the deceased's high status is proved by the signature of a particularly self-conscious

²¹ Garulli (2008), 626, 638.

²² Agosti (2008) finds in the second century CE the widest gap, in terms of length, between literary epigram and inscriptional epitaph, quoting as his examples the epigram of twenty-one lines for Pantarchus (see n. 12 in this chapter) and the twin epigrams on Ariston's *columbarium*, SGO III 21/24/02 (Philadelphia, Palaestina, 139/140 CE).

²³ See Garulli (2012), 368–73 and (2014b), 127–32.

²⁴ Marek (1993). See Garulli (2012), 371–3.

²⁵ See Santin (2009); Barbantani (2018).

²⁶ See Chaniotis (2009).

professional poet, placed at the end of the epitaph he was hired to compose. The case of Herodes of Hassaia is emblematic: his long epitymbian elegies for the members of the family of a powerful Greek Egyptian officer, probably the commissioner of all the epitaphs (late second century BCE), are verbose and elaborate and certainly stand out in the local cemetery, but they are not particularly sophisticated.²⁷ Herodes' signature at the end of each poem shows that the family could afford a professional poet. However, we have not yet found other epitaphs signed by this poet. It has been suggested, though without any solid evidence, that Herodes' activity was not limited to Egypt, since his epigrams share some stylistic features with another epitaph: the anonymous SGO I 05/01/35,²⁸ commissioned by the *demos* of Smyrna—an honorary–funerary inscription in elegiacs for two men (father and son), both called Democles. Indeed, professional poets were not an exclusive characteristic of the Hellenized Mediterranean area but could also wander and prosper at the periphery of the Greek-speaking world, as is proven by the case of Ariston, who signed an epigram found in Susiana that celebrates the statue of the commander and satrap Zamaspes (37–32 BCE).²⁹

Was the generally poor quality of inscriptional military epitaphs from the Hellenistic period enough to make them unpopular as an epigrammatic subgenre and to induce ancient collectors to leave them out of their anthologies? Before the development of the long, elaborate 'epitaphic biopics' attested since the third century BCE, was there ever a 'Hellenistic Simonides', a champion and model for military inscriptional epitaphs, who could compose pieces worthy of being copied in books and preserved in libraries? Considerations of identity, ambition, emulation of the heroic models of the past, and desire to display an epitaph with both literary and ideological appeal help us to explain why not only a *polis* but also individuals, if they could afford it, may have requested the service of renowned poets to compose epitaphs for the war dead. On both public and private commission, Simonides wrote epitaphs that became literary blueprints for any future professional epigrammatist. With the dawn of the Hellenistic era, the phenomenon of professional poets of any specialization exploded, as is documented in numerous studies on the guilds of professional artists (*technitai*) that have been published in the last decades.³⁰ Self-proclaimed 'poets' were not always accomplished artists, but their affluent commissioners, craving a prominent status symbol, were often contented with a bombastic, inelegant poem.

²⁷ See Santin (2009), 170–97; Barbantani (2014), 303–6.

²⁸ Found in Smyrna; see Santin (2009), 183.

²⁹ SGO III 12/03/03, Susa, 9/8 BCE or 2/3 CE = *IK Estremo oriente* 214; Merkelbach and Stauber (2005), 405.

³⁰ See Le Guen (2001); Aneziri (2003); Hunter and Rutherford (2009).

4. HELLENISTIC MILITARY EPITAPHS FROM THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY

As far as we know, in the Hellenistic and Roman periods no author of literary epigrams was also famous for composing real (i.e. inscribed) military epitaphs, or in fact any other kind of inscriptional epitaph whose production could be compared in breadth and quality with the Simonidean one. In the seventh Book of the *Greek Anthology*, fictitious epitaphs are common stock: we find poems for men lost at sea, laments for children and brides prematurely departed or for faithful wives who died during labour, and even epitaphs for pets; an impressive number of fictional epitaphs are also dedicated to poets, philosophers, and otherwise famous historical figures (e.g. Themistocles),³¹ and many fictitious war epitaphs honour Homeric heroes. The clearly fictitious epigrams with military content in Book 7 of the *Greek Anthology* can be distributed as follows:

- epitaphs or epigrams that focus on the deaths of Homeric heroes: Priam (Antip. Thess. AP 7.136 = *GPh* 55); Hector (anon. AP 7.137, Acerat. AP 7.138 = *FGE* 1); Achilles (anon. AP 7.142–3); Nestor (anon. AP 7.144); Protesilaus (Antiphil. AP 7.141 = *GPh* 23, Phil. AP 7.385 = *GPh* 33); Ajax (AP 7.145–50, anon. AP 7.152);³²
- epitaphs for famous politicians and generals, for example: Themistocles (Tull. Gem. AP 7.73 = *GPh* 1, Diod. AP 7.74 = *GPh* 14, AP 7.235–7); Aristomenes (Antip. Sid. AP 7.161 = *HE* 20);³³ Philip of Macedon (Adaeus AP 7.238 = *GPh* 4); Alexander (Adaeus AP 7.240 = *GPh* 5);
- variations on the topos of Spartan virtues: some of these epigrams are simply narrative, others echo the structure of an inscribed epitaph, and many include the theme of the Spartan mother slaying a cowardly son (Diosc. AP 7.229 = *HE* 30, Eryc. AP 7.230 = *GPh* 12, AP 7.433–6, Antip. Thess. AP 7.531 = *GPh* 23);
- ironical, and probably fictitious, are: Pisander of Rhodes AP 7.304, a spoof of the epitaph for a noble horseman,³⁴ and Leonidas AP 7.448 = *HE* 12³⁵ (as well as its anonymous variation, AP 7.449), presenting hyperbolic praise for a young Pratalidas, a ‘pinnacle’ in everything (love, wisdom, battle, and hunting).

³¹ On these types of funerary epigrams, see the chapters by Demoen, Romero, Tueller, and Hunter in this volume.

³² On the epitaphs of Homeric heroes, see Harder (2007); Barbantani (2016; forthcoming).

³³ See Barbantani (2014), 332–3.

³⁴ Pisander of Rhodes, GV 865. See Keydell (1935).

³⁵ Bettenworth (2007), 74–6.

While many kinds of death are contemplated in this collection, a topic that did not receive particular favour among Hellenistic epigrammatists (or among later anthologists) is the death in battle of individual and well-characterized contemporary military men. In the real world, the military epitaph, ranging from the predictable elegiac couplet to the most pretentious biographical piece, is one of the most common types of inscriptional poems, but fictitious epitaphs for common soldiers are in fact quite rare in the *Greek Anthology*. Even epitymbian epigrams for individual fighters, possibly composed originally in order to be inscribed, are infrequent in the *Greek Anthology*, if we exclude the Simonidean corpus and the epitaphs for collective graves.³⁶ This is striking, considering (a) that, since the fourth century BCE,³⁷ the collection and study of inscriptions is a well-documented scholarly activity (see Philochorus of Athens, *Attic epigrams* (Ἐπιγράμματα Ἀττικά); Neoptolemus of Parium, *On Epigrams* (Περὶ ἐπιγραμμάτων);³⁸ Polemon of Ilium, *On the Epigrams Found in Cities* (Περὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις ἐπιγραμμάτων);³⁹ Aristodemus of Alexandria, *Theban Epigrams* (Θηβαϊκὰ ἐπιγράμματα));⁴⁰ and (b) that some war epitaphs from the archaic and classical ages were in fact preserved both on stone and on papyrus.⁴¹ This lack of actual Hellenistic military epitaphs in the *Greek Anthology* may reflect a specific choice on the part of compilers of literary *florilegia* or may indicate that professional epigrammatists preferred to compose military epitaphs on commission rather than fictional versions of them and that they did not publish as a collection (or part of a collection) the few that they wrote. Leaving aside the material attributed to Simonides, the Hellenistic epitaphs for individual soldiers that might have been originally inscriptional are only a dozen; moreover, none of them has been convincingly proved or disproved to have been initially inscribed. On the one hand, their style and typology does not differ too much from those of early epigrams inscribed on

³⁶ See the clusters AP 7.242–59, 7.296–301, and 7.442–3, which include epigrams ranging chronologically from Simonides to Antipater of Sidon. Inscriptional or fictional poems for *polyandria* or in general for collective bodies of warriors (e.g. the heroes of the Persian Wars) are well represented in the *Greek Anthology*.

³⁷ Wade-Gery (1933), followed by A. Petrovic (2007b) and Tsagalis (2008), 53, suggest that Aeschines' citation of the so-called Eion epigram is based on a collection of epideictic war epigrams compiled as early as the fifth century BCE.

³⁸ Ath. 10.454f = F 7 Mette. ³⁹ Ath. 10. 436d, 442e.

⁴⁰ See Higbie (1999); Tsagalis (2008), 53; Schmitz (2010a), 370–9.

⁴¹ See A. Petrovic (2007a; 2007b, 92–5; 2013); Kaczko (2009). I agree with Schmitz (2010a), 371: 'the Hellenistic poets came to know many of these older texts not exclusively in the form of actual inscriptions, but also partly through collections in papyrus-rolls. Their own epigrams recreated, for their own readers, the intellectual and emotional response which these collected inscriptions, severed from their original context, elicited from their readership.' Schmitz (2010a), 386–9 argues that the Alexandrian poets may have known decontextualized inscribed epigrams through author- or location-based anthologies, quotations in erudite or historical works, and 'copy books'.

stone. On the other hand, generic content and the lack of personal names and biographical details do not necessarily imply that a funerary poem was not originally inscribed: sometimes those data were added in prose to real inscriptions.⁴² To be more specific, the only Hellenistic epitaphs for individual soldiers in the seventh Book of the *Greek Anthology* are the following:

- ‘Anacreon’: AP 7.226 = FGE 1 = GV 915, an epitaph for Agathon, and AP 7.160 = FGE 2, an epitaph for Timocritus. If AP 7.160 was originally inscriptional, it must have been anonymous; most probably, though, it is a literary exercise, since during the Hellenistic period many epigrams were ascribed to famous archaic poets; the *sententia* expressed in the pentameter (Ἄρης δ’ οὐκ ἀγαθῶν φεῖδεται, ἀλλὰ κακῶν, ‘Ares does not spare the valiant ones, but the cowards’, v. 2) captured Paul Friedländer’s attention for not being a typical feature of archaic and classical inscriptions.⁴³ AP 7.226 could be inscriptional, but it has some interesting literary touches. Page suspected that it was attributed to Anacreon only because of the reference to Abdera.⁴⁴
- Anyte: AP 7.724 = HE 4, an epitaph for ‘Proarchus’ (cf. GV 1465); AP 7.232 = HE 21 = SGO I Lydia 04/25/01, an epitaph for Amyntor (second century BCE).⁴⁵ AP 7.724 presents many philological problems, especially in its first verse,⁴⁶ and the name Proarchus, which appears also in the lemma, is undocumented. The structure and the content resemble, in their simplicity, those of many inscriptional epitaphs, while verse 2 echoes Aeschylus’ *Persians* 535–6. Gow and Page raise no objections to an originally inscriptional use of AP 7.232,⁴⁷ which is attributed by the scribe J to Anyte, by Planudes to Antipater of Sidon.⁴⁸ According to them, the date of Amyntor’s death in Lydia should more likely be placed around 300 BCE (Anyte’s likely *floruit*) rather than in the late second century BCE (which makes Amyntor a contemporary of Antipater of Sidon).⁴⁹ Merkelbach and Stauber went as far as to include the piece in their

⁴² The criteria presented by Bettenworth (2007), 73–4, for distinguishing a literary epitaph from an inscriptional one can be valid in many cases, but not always, as she also observes on p. 85 n. 66.

⁴³ Friedländer (1942), 69. Cf. Page (1981), 135.

⁴⁴ Page (1981), 134.

⁴⁵ See Roy (2009).

⁴⁶ See Gow and Page (1965), 2: 93–4; Ypsilanti (2003), 505–7, with parallels also in Garulli (2012), 110–16 and 56–63; Snyder (1989), 69; Geoghegan (1979), 57–8; Gutzwiller (1998), 54; Greene (2005), 152–6.

⁴⁷ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 102.

⁴⁸ The error is due to a wrong interpretation of an abbreviation of the epigrammatist’s name; see Argentieri (2003), 201–2: in principle the author could be Antipater of Sidon, but his epigrams for warriors are richer in imagery and symbology, while a straight Homerizing style is typical of Anyte’s poetry.

⁴⁹ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 102.

collection of *Steinepigramme*, with an unknown *Fundort* (SGO I 490). Waltz does not exclude the possibility that Amyntor was a soldier of Alexander's army, but he remarks that a later chronology is also acceptable.⁵⁰ In any case, since we know nothing of Anyte's life except her connection with the Peloponnese and—only ideally—with Mytilene, Sappho's homeland, a commission for a real epitaph in Lydia looks unlikely. To this list we can add AP 7.208 = HE 9, an original, sympathetic epitaph for a war horse that could have been devised for a stele⁵¹ or may fall into the category of 'fictional epitaphs for animals'.⁵²

- Diotimus: AP 7.227 = HE 2, an epitaph for Crinagoras. Gow and Page do not rule out the possibility that this poem was a genuine epitaph.⁵³ It is still disputed whether the deceased's homeland is mentioned in the epigram.⁵⁴ The warrior's image as a lion is Homeric, while the possible allusion to Callimachus in verse 2 has already been mentioned.⁵⁵
- Damagetus: AP 7.231 = HE 4, AP 7.438 = HE 5, AP 7.540 = HE 7, and AP 7.541 = HE 6. All epigrams probably concern real soldiers who were killed in third-century wars involving Achaia and Aetolia. More particularly, AP 7.231 may have been inspired by the following military event:⁵⁶ Aristagoras' homeland, Ambracia, held by the Aetolians, was captured by Philip V and his Epirote allies in 219 BCE (Plb. 4.61). The epitaph could accompany a statue or a relief of Aristagoras holding his shield. However, it also fits well in the series of literary exercises celebrating Spartan virtues that were mentioned earlier in this section. If we accept Scaliger's conjecture of *Πατρέων* (v. 1),⁵⁷ AP 7.438 is to be placed in the context of the Social War (220–217 BCE): this means that the deceased, Machatas, belonged to the Achaean League (which sided with Philip II in the fight against the Aetolians, who were supported by Sparta), and perished during an Aetolian attack against Patras (Plb. 4.6.9, 7.2, 10.2, 25.4, and 5.30.3). AP 7.540 does not explicitly refer to military action: apparently

⁵⁰ Waltz (2002), 156 n. 2.

⁵¹ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 95–6.

⁵² See Ypsilanti (2003), 504–5; Barbantani (2014), 327. For epigrams dedicated to race horses, see Barbantani (2012), 50–1.

⁵³ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 273.

⁵⁴ See *εἰ δὲ κάλυμμι' ὀλίγον* in v. 3: *Petit est son pays* (Waltz 2002); 'If this his covering be little' (Paton); for Wilamowitz (1924), 1: 143 the correct reading would be 'Kalyмна' = Kalydna, a small island near Cos. See Gow and Page (1965), 2: 273.

⁵⁵ See p. 157 here.

⁵⁶ The lemmatist J refers to an 'Aristagoras Ambraciotes'; then, after AP 7.438, he names the man 'Areimenes'; see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 225; Friedländer (1942), 80.

⁵⁷ The ms. has *πατέρων* (which is also the word in the last verse of the preceding epigram). Gow and Page (1965), 2: 226 accept Scaliger's emendation, but they also find the reading *πατέρων ληίδα* ('ancestral cattle') defensible (cf. A.R. Argon. 1.695).

Menis and Polynicus, from 'Aeolian Thebes',⁵⁸ found their death in an ambush by Thracians⁵⁹ and perished far from home, hence the motif of the *angelia* addressed to the passer-by, already used in the Simonidean epitaph for the 300 Spartans at Thermopylae.⁶⁰ AP 7.541⁶¹ is an epitaph for the Elean Chaeronides (cf. IG V.2, 356.7; SEG 53 (2003), no. 523),⁶² who died in a battle in Achaëa. Elis was a member of the Aetolian League in 219 BCE (Plb. 4.36.6),⁶³ when its army invaded Achaëa.

- Antipater of Sidon: AP 7.426 = HE 31, on the lion protecting Teleutias' tomb. At first glance this poem looks like a literary exercise on the topos of 'animals guarding a tomb',⁶⁴ with a dialogic structure. Nothing forces us to exclude, however, its use as a real epitaph, especially when we consider that Teleutias, Theodorus' son, is probably to be identified with a prominent citizen of Cos.⁶⁵ The epigram is similar in content and style to inscriptional epitaphs that describe or interpret symbols on a tomb—such as SGO IV 19/10/01 (not necessarily dependent on Antipater), an epitaph from Kanytelis, Cilicia, which is a *variatio* on the same subject: a lion marks the boundaries of the Sandaeus' territory.⁶⁶ A dialogue with a lion that guards the tomb features, moreover, in an inscriptional epitaph from Memphis, Egypt.⁶⁷
- Theodoridas: AP 7.529 = HE 10 and AP 7.722 = HE 11. The first epigram, inspired by tragedy,⁶⁸ praises the sacrifice of Thessalian Dorotheus, who opposed Macedonian rule and defended the freedom of Phthia, possibly when it was under attack by Antigonos Doson or Philip V. The

⁵⁸ Thebes in Phthiotis. Taken by the Aetolians, the city was conquered in 217 BCE by Philip V, who renamed it Philippopolis.

⁵⁹ The Thracians could be Philip's soldiers; I find the hypothesis that they were robbers (Gow and Page 1965, 2: 227) less likely.

⁶⁰ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 226 compare the epigram to Asclep. AP 7.500 = HE 31, a cenotaph of a shipwrecked man from Chios.

⁶¹ See Legrand (1901), 186; Friedländer (1942), 80. The dialect used in the epigram is Doric.

⁶² Painted stele from Demetrias, Thessaly, for a Cretan archer named Chaeronides; see Post (2009), 24, 27.

⁶³ Cf. Gow and Page (1965), 2: 226.

⁶⁴ See e.g. Bernand (1969), no. 68 (the lion on the tomb of Heras speaks with a passer-by); further examples in Barbantani (2014), 329–32.

⁶⁵ He is not the Spartan half-brother of King Agesilaus II, but he is a citizen of Cos honoured in a *proxenia* decree of Iasus (second century BCE) as 'Teleutias son of Theodorus'; see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 59. See Snyder (1989), 69–70; Gutzwiller (1993); Greene (2005); Ypsilanti (2003). On the epigram, see Benedetto (2004), 192–3, 217; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 333–5. For animals guarding the tombs of warriors, see Barbantani (2014), 329–33.

⁶⁶ Garulli (2012), 142–50. Cf. GV 1178; SGO I 01/06/01, an epitaph for Diagoras and his wife Aristomacha from Syrna, Caria (fourth–third century BCE) that refers to two statues of lions guarding the tomb. The epigram is engraved on the lintel over the door of a house tomb: in the garden of the house near the tomb there is still a stone lion.

⁶⁷ GV 1843 = Bernand (1969), no. 68 (first–second century CE).

⁶⁸ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 543; for v. 1, compare E. fr. 237 Nauck.

mention of freedom (v. 3) is frequent in *polyandria* and individual inscriptional epitaphs from *poleis* that fought for their independence against various rulers during the third and second centuries BCE. The second epigram is just one elegiac couplet following the tradition of the archaic epitaphs and is dedicated to Timosthenes, Molossus' son, who fell while fighting in Attica; the topos of dying in a foreign land is present in inscriptional as well as in literary epitaphs.⁶⁹ According to Waltz, the speaking voice belongs to a figure on the tomb.⁷⁰ Peek tentatively also attributed to Theodoridas the epitaph for Antigenes of Demetrias (GV 943),⁷¹ a piece unique in its depiction of gory death on the battleground.⁷² The expression in verse 3, *πεπαλαγμένον*, is found also in a puzzling third-century BCE poem from Susiana, previously considered an epigram, now a poem in hexameters, on a warrior's death.⁷³

As I pointed out earlier in this section, there is no strong evidence that any literary epigrammatist known from the *Greek Anthology* also acted as a professional writer of inscriptional military epitaphs. However, we can proceed to some hypotheses of attribution based on the style and content of the surviving epitaphs. One of the authors included in Meleager's *Garland* who is likely to have also been a professional composer of inscribed epitaphs is Damagetus. What survives from his work suggests that he was sometimes writing on commission—since, in spite of his own political preference for Sparta and its Aetolian allies,⁷⁴ he did not take sides when it came to producing epitaphs. This is shown in a piece (AP 7.438) that celebrates an Achaean killed during the Social War. According to Friedländer, another non-philospartan epigram that recalls Damagetus' style is the epitaph for Sopolis (IG IX, 1² 2:314),⁷⁵ a soldier who was probably killed around 191 BCE, when the Aetolian and Syrian troops attacked the Acarnanian city of Thyreion. Unfortunately nothing is known about Damagetus' life; he was possibly a Peloponnesian, like Anyte (though the language of his epigrams is only superficially Doric, namely in AP 7.231 = HE 4 and AP 1 = HE 11).

⁶⁹ Cf. Theoc. or Leon. AP 7.661.3 (= Theoc. HE 10.3); Mel. AP 12.158.3 = HE 93.3; the Syrian epitaphs discussed here, p. 156. Gow and Page (1965), 2: 544 suggest that the tomb could be a cenotaph.

⁷⁰ Waltz (1960), 160 n. 1.

⁷¹ See Moretti (1976), 2: 88–90, no. 107; Peek (1973), 69; SEG 42 (1995), no. 498; Helly (1992).

⁷² See Barbantani (2014), 321–2.

⁷³ SGO V, new text 24/17 = 12/03/99 (Susiana); IK *Estremo oriente* no. 187; SEG 49 (1999), no. 1976; SEG 53.2 (2003), no. 1780 (with commentary); Henry (2003); Rougemont (2001).

⁷⁴ On Spartan virtues, see e.g. Damag. AP 7.432 = HE 3 and AP 195 = HE 12. In praise of the Aetolians, see Damag. AP 7.231, anon. or 'Simon.' AP 7.431 = 'Simon.' HE 5, Damag. AP 7.438 = HE 5, Call. AP 7.451 = HE 41 (Elis was allied with the Aetolians), Damag. AP 6.277 = HE 1, which refers to a dedication by Arsinoe, daughter of Ptolemy III Euergetes; the Ptolemies supported the Aetolians but did not intervene in the Social War (Gow and Page 1965, 2: 223).

⁷⁵ Friedländer (1942), 82 n. 6. See Barbantani (2018), 298–304.

Another good candidate for the title of ‘Simonides’ epigone’ could be Posidippus, although neither the *Greek Anthology* nor the Milan Papyrus (*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII* 309) preserve traces of epitaphs for military men penned by the Macedonian poet. The epitymbian section of the Milan Papyrus (42–61 A–B) is almost entirely devoted to women, with just a couple of exceptions (60–1 A–B on old men). Epigrams dedicated to deceased soldiers and composed for inscriptional purpose, that is, as companion pieces to statues representing celebrated soldiers (four in total), still feature among his *dubia* and are recorded only in Fernández Galiano’s edition.⁷⁶ The *proxenia* received by Posidippus from the Aetolian League as ἐπιγραμματοποιὸς Πελλαῖος (*IG IX*,¹ 1.17, l. 24, Thermos, c.262–236 BCE), as well as the *proxenia* awarded to him and to one Asclepiades by the Delphians (*FD III* 3.192, 273/2 BCE), must be linked to public commissions—either anathematic or funerary—rather than to private ones. Except for the epigram that accompanies the statue of the Aetolian cavalry officer Scorpion, dedicated by his father,⁷⁷ it is impossible to assess whether in the cases mentioned here it was the *polis* or the family that commissioned a poem in praise of the fallen citizen.⁷⁸ A careful analysis of the style and content of the Posidippean *dubia* conducted by Valentina Garulli on the one hand disproves the attribution of some of them to Posidippus,⁷⁹ but on the other hand does not confirm beyond any doubt the Posidippean authorship of other epigrams (such as those for Scorpion and Nicasichorus). Although several literary epigrams can safely be attributed to Posidippus, it is difficult to set a benchmark for the inscriptional ones, since we are far from having a complete stylistic survey of every single inscriptional epigram found in the territories where Posidippus was active. In any case, such a survey will not be conclusive, since the poet’s style could vary according to age, poetic subject, and literary subgenre. Moreover, literary tastes and styles of inscriptional epigrams may belong to a local culture or ‘school’ rather than to a single individual poet, and the pieces can be imitations of Posidippus rather than original compositions. It must also be kept in mind that, if Posidippus was indeed a professional poet like Damagetus, the origin of the dedicatee would not be a safe criterion for attributing specific epigrams to him.

⁷⁶ Fernández-Galiano (1987): *Dubia* 31–3, 35. On these epigrams, see Garulli (2016); Angiò (2010).

⁷⁷ Posidipp. *Dubia* no. 31 Fernández-Galiano; see Barbantani (2014), 324.

⁷⁸ See A. Petrovic (2009), 212, who refers to Dem. *De cor.* 289, which mentions the epigram (= anon. *FGE* 126) chosen by the *polis* for the fallen of the battle of Chaeronea in 338 BCE. The ποιητῆς ἐπὶ τῶν Πολίτας was awarded *proxenia* by the *polis* of Lamia, owing to his poetic profession; he was possibly an epigrammatist. See *IG IX*.2, 63 (third–second century BCE; cf. *Corrigenda* p. IX, *SGDI* II 1441).

⁷⁹ Garulli (2016).

5. BETWEEN THE BOOK AND THE STONE: LOCAL AND WANDERING PROFESSIONAL POETS

The authorship of a literary epigram is in most cases provided by the lemma in the *Greek Anthology* or by the literary source in which the epigram survives, though the reliability of that source varies and should always be assessed. More problematic is the case of exclusively inscriptional epigrams. Given that some formulae or stylistic features are recurrent in epitaphs for soldiers as well as other categories of dead, it has been suggested that, for cheap individual epitaphs, either local versifiers collaborating with workshops that specialized in erecting the entire tomb or wandering professional poets were usually commissioned, at a reasonable price.⁸⁰ The lack of a specific, recognizable, personal style makes it difficult to trace the same hand in inscribed epitaphs from the same period, even within the same geographical area. Moreover, private inscriptional epitaphs, as well as public ones (whose authorship may have been preserved in historical sources), are generally not signed: it is untypical to come across the names of professional poets who composed private epitaphs either from their own signature on the stone, as in the case of Herodes,⁸¹ or from inscriptions that mention the deceased's profession, as does the prose epitaph⁸² of Herenius, a Greek Egyptian epigrammatist from Abou Billou.⁸³

Most authors of military epitaphs, then, if they did not sign their poems on stone or if they were not renowned as literary poets, are destined to remain unidentified. Such professionals, whatever their level of competence in versification might have been, had a literary education mostly imbued with Homer, who remained one of the principal authors in the Greek syllabus for centuries, and with some elegiac, lyric, and tragic 'classics'. By the first century BCE, anthologies like that of Meleager could also offer inspiration to professional poets working with stone, but, as we have seen, Hellenistic literary models for war epitaphs were limited; the main literary-epigraphic reference remained the Simonidean corpus, possibly along with collections of local inscriptions assembled from the fourth century BCE onwards, about which, however, we have only poor or hypothetical knowledge.⁸⁴ It has been suggested that the *technitai* ('professional versifiers') associated with workshops that specialized in building the entire funerary monument could rely on 'sample books' or

⁸⁰ On wandering poets, see Guarducci (1929); A. Cameron (1965b); Hunter and Rutherford (2009).

⁸¹ See p. 160 in this volume.

⁸² Boyaval (2001), 53.

⁸³ Terenouthis, first-second century CE. See El-Nassery, Wagner, and Hafeez Abdul-Al (1978), 237–8; Santin (2009), 155.

⁸⁴ See p. 155 in this chapter.

'pattern books' for composing their epitaphs on commission.⁸⁵ The nature of these 'copy books' is still to be proved, and I have some doubts that they actually existed as a specific type of anthology. What we have in our possession is only papyrus versions of individual epitaphs, possibly composed to be inscribed (such as the epitaphs for Tauron, Zenon's dog: see *SH* 977), and personal anthologies of (not necessarily inscriptional) poems, gathered over time by people other than poets, such as the brothers Apollonius and Ptolemy, the *katochoi* of the Memphite Serapeum: among their private papers, copies of epigrams composed by Posidippus on Ptolemaic monuments have been discovered (i.e. epigrams 115–16 A–B).⁸⁶ The recurrent presence of some formulae in epitaphs from certain areas and their link to special regional features (e.g. the epigrams for the 'tower tombs/dovecotes' in the Middle East)⁸⁷ may indeed speak in favour of the existence of local schools of professional versifiers associated with workshops of engravers and sculptors. Other stylistic characteristics, however, such as the Homeric formula *ἐν προμάχοις* ('in the front line of battle') or other equivalent phrases,⁸⁸ are so commonly used in epitaphs of the entire Greek-speaking world, in areas very far apart, that it would be unreasonable to explain them only as the product of a wide diffusion of standard 'regional sample collections'. Instead of manuals with only formulae or dry models of single verses, I prefer to think that personal anthologies of both inscriptional and non-inscriptional poems existed that were collected by individual *technitai* or amateurs and then handed down to their apprentices or circle of colleagues, who could then in turn add some of their own favourites.

The relationship between poets, engravers, and sculptors employed at the same 'burial services shop' is suggested by the double epitaph of Menas of Byzantium, the representative of a wealthy Bithynian Hellenized ruling class known mostly through a series of funerary stelae that date from the second to the first century BCE.⁸⁹ The influence of a literary model is evident not only from the style but also from the layout of the inscriptional piece. The battle of

⁸⁵ See Lattimore (1942), 19–20; Tsagalis (2008), 53–7; cf. Clairmont (1970), xviii; Garulli (2012), 83, 384, and 217; Cagnat (1889). A Greek example of recurrent formulae, highlighted by Garulli (2012, 217), is *SGO* III 16/22/02, copied several times between the fourth century BCE and the third century CE.

⁸⁶ Pordomingo (2013), 258–76.

⁸⁷ See pp. 171–3 here. Tower tomb/dovecotes are mostly from Syria: *SGO* III 21/24/02, 22/15/02, 22/23/01, 22/42/99, 22/44/01 and 02; *SGO* IV 22/14/02, 22/42/08 (cf. *SGO* IV 22/42/98), 22/38/99.

⁸⁸ See Barbantani (2014), 307, 314, 316, 318, and 320.

⁸⁹ *SGO* II 09/05/16 (Nicaea, c.159–154 BCE). See Fantuzzi (2008), 603–22; Fantuzzi (2010); Barbantani (2014), 315–16, 324; Garulli (2014b), 151–2. Cf. A. Petrovic (2009), 211, who states that parallel epigrams in private dedications or graves are known since the fourth century BCE. For a survey of the Bithynian stelae, see Post (forthcoming).

Corupedium mentioned in the first epitaph is not the famous clash of 281 BCE but a later one, which took place around 154 BCE;⁹⁰ moreover, the analysis of the literary style and the strange nature of both epigrams point to the second century BCE rather than to the early third. According to Marco Fantuzzi, up until the fourth century BCE, in the rare cases where a monument displays more than one epigram on the same theme, the epigrams focus on different aspects of the topic and complement each other, while (as he notes) in the epigrams for Menas there is evidence of *variatio*, a procedure more common in Hellenistic anthologies of literary epigrams⁹¹ devised for publication in a book.⁹² Moreover, it has been suggested that the term *ἄλλο* between the two Menas epigrams may point, if not to a literary model used by the engraver,⁹³ then to the attempt to re-create on stone the layout of a papyrus roll where two epigrams that offer variations on the same theme are copied one after the other in the same *selis* ('column of writing') and divided by a 'separator'. Was this a peculiar experiment made by a daring *maestro di bottega*, or rather a way to 'ennoble' with a fake bookish form⁹⁴ the poems that immortalized Menas' virtues? Since the stone was customized for the inscription and the two epitaphs fit on it perfectly, we should reject the hypothesis that the poems have been written at different moments in time, even though they seem to have been incised by different engravers and composed by different poets. Maybe the family relied on more than one poet (perhaps a professional poet and a relative?); or maybe they could not decide which one was better. In any case, whoever was responsible for the choice of keeping or inserting *ἄλλο* between the two poems was certainly familiar with the process of (private) anthologizing.

⁹⁰ For a discussion of the chronology, see Bar-Kochva (1974), who shifts the chronology down to 159–154 BCE, and Dumitru (2013), 80–2, who prefers an earlier date in the third century BCE.

⁹¹ Fantuzzi (2008), 613 notices that the first epigram has a more didactic tone and is placed immediately under the relief that illustrates Menas' victory over two warriors. For parallels, see Fantuzzi (2010), 309–10. The only Hellenistic use of *ἄλλο* between two inscriptional epigrams is found in Bernand (1969), no. 33 (second century BCE; see Garulli 2014b, 153–5); other examples date from the second to the sixth century CE: GV 1981 (second–third century CE, Rome), GV 1982 (third century CE, Attica), GV 1996 (second–third century CE, Athens), SGO III 15/02/07 (fourth century CE, Ancyra), GV 1999 (fourth century CE, Nicaea = anon. AP 15.4–8), GV 2000 (sixth century CE, Palaestina Tertia).

⁹² Fantuzzi (2010).

⁹³ Keil (1902) suggested that an inept engraver copied what he saw on the papyrus, including the *ἄλλο* that separated the epigrams: one can compare this case study to the student who copied *ἄλλο* in *O. Wilcken 1148* (= *BKT V* 1, p. 78; *P. Berol. inv.* 4757). For the entry *ἄλλο* in epigrammatic anthologies, see Pordomingo (2013), 18–19 and the chapter by Petrovic in this volume.

⁹⁴ Garulli (2014b), 152 even points out the peculiar, literary style of the script, as if the engraver tried to emulate a contemporary book hand.

6. ANONYMOUS INSCRIPTIONAL EPITAPHS
PRESERVED IN THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY:
THE CASE STUDY OF AP 7.228 = HE 44

Like any other book, anthologies and sample books could travel along with their owners throughout the Greek-speaking world. If a famous inscriptional epitaph of a region ended up becoming a universal model, then the dream of an epigram travelling like a majestic epic poem through space and time (the wish expressed at Anyt. AP 7.724.3–4; cf. Homer,⁹⁵ Pi. N. 5.1–5, and Thgn. 237–54) would have been fulfilled. Our evidence, unfortunately, is far more prosaic. Along with the epigram for Soterichus (anon. AP 7.678), which was analysed in section 2 here, the *Greek Anthology* preserves only one other inscriptional funerary military poem, which belongs to a well-known inscriptional typology of epitaph, specifically the one composed for the *Grabturm-Taubenschlag* ('tower tomb, occasionally hosting a dovecote'):

αὐτῷ καὶ τεκέεσσι γυναικί τε τύμβον ἔδειμεν
Ἀνδροτίων· οὐπω δ' οὐδενός εἰμι τάφος.
οὕτω καὶ μέναιμι πολλὸν χρόνον· εἰ δ' ἄρα καὶ δεῖ,
δεξαίμην ἐν ἐμοὶ τοὺς προτέρους προτέρους.
(anon. AP 7.228)

For himself, his children and his wife
Androtion built me. As yet I am no one's grave
and so may I remain for long; but if it must be so,
may I give earlier welcome to the earlier born.⁹⁶

Soldiers could earn a modest fortune, sufficient even to grant some elementary 'luxuries' for their family, including a private family tomb; when this happened, the head of the family was very keen to boast of his achievement by adding this information to the structure, in an epigram. In the Roman East these monuments frequently belong to the type of tower tomb known as 'tomb dovecote', which means a family tomb with an incorporated pigeon coop tower; doves in Egypt provided eggs and food and were raised in great numbers. It is almost a kind of poetic justice that the money gained from one's military career should end up in doves! The epigrams accompanying the tower tombs are very similar to one another, employing a limited number of recurrent expressions to define the same few concepts. This may suggest, if not the use of the hypothesized 'copy books', simply the presence of the same versifiers (active in business one generation after the other). Compare, for instance, AP 7.228 with the incipit of the epigram for the officer Aeneas from

⁹⁵ See n. 1 in this chapter.

⁹⁶ Edited text and translation (adapted) by Paton (1916–18), 2: 128–9. On the epigram, see Christian (2015), 70–2.

Zorava (Palaestina), who, after having finally retired, built a ‘splendid’ tomb dovecote for himself and his children⁹⁷ (αὐτῶ καὶ τεκέεσσιν ἐδείματο σῆμα φαιινόν | Αἰνείας), as well as with an epigram for a retired officer’s tomb from Rimea, Syria (second to fourth century CE):⁹⁸

Καιλεστίνος πινυτός με ἐδείματο τῶδ’ ἐνὶ χώρῳ.
 αὐτῶ καὶ τεκέεσσι φίλῃ τ’ ἀλόχῳ ἐποίησεν
 νηὸν Πλουτῆι καὶ ἐπαυῇ Φερσεφονείῃ
 ἐσθλῆς ἐκ στρατιῆς. νῦν δ’ οὐδενός εἰμι τάφο[ς] πω·
 οὕτω καὶ μείναιμι πολὺν χρόνον· εἰ δ’ ἄρα καὶ δεῖ,
 δεξαίμην γηράσκοντας, εὐδαίμονας, τεκνώσαντας.
 (SGO IV 22/23/01)

5

Wise Caelestinus built me in this place
 for himself, his children and his wife
 as a temple for Pluto and the dreadful Persephone,
 (with the earning) from his honourable military service.
 Now I am no one’s grave.
 So may I also remain for a long time; but if it must be,
 may I welcome them old, happy, and with children.

Generally, in the epigrams for tomb dovecotes the tower speaks in the first person (the inscription appears on tablets attached to the wall), declaring the name of the family member who erected it (ἐδείματο, v. 1), affirming the undertaking of heavy expenses,⁹⁹ and sometimes cursing or imposing a fine on whoever would try to use the family tomb for his own sepulture.¹⁰⁰ Among the banal and endless repetition of the same basic formulae, however, we might come across glimpses of originality, such as in SGO IV 22/39/01,¹⁰¹ where the use of the rare epic and tragic adjective πολυλῆϊος (‘with many cornfields’, ‘fruitful’) is noteworthy.¹⁰²

It is almost a miracle that AP 7.228, a banal epitaph of a type known by the dozen, was promoted to the rank of ‘literary epitaphs’ collected into the *Greek Anthology*, while other, longer and far more interesting epigraphic variations on the same theme have not been included. Not all of the inscriptions on tomb dovecotes or *Grabturmen* (‘tower tombs’) seem in fact to be stock-produced;

⁹⁷ SGO IV 22/14/02 (Ezr’a, second–third century CE); GV 270; Kaibel (1878), 448; Zingerle (1926), 403–4.

⁹⁸ Cf. SEG 20 (1964), no. 395 (Syria, fourth century CE); Dussaud and Macler (1901), 203, 88; Robert (1960), 323–5; Meimaris and Makrygianni (2008), no. 38; IGLS 15, 389.

⁹⁹ SGO III 22/42/99 (Bosra).

¹⁰⁰ See e.g. SGO IV 22/42/98 (Bosra, Hauran, second–third century CE), SGO IV 22/38/99 (Bosana, Arabia); for the *Grabturm-Taubenschlag*, see also SGO III 21/24/02 (Philadelphia), SGO III 22/44/01 and 02 (Ghariye-Sharquie).

¹⁰¹ Epitaph for Kaiamos from Sounoa, Syria, second–third century CE.

¹⁰² Cf. *Il.* 5.613; Hes. *Fr.* 240.1 M–W; S. *Tr.* 1167; Arat. *Phaen.* 1.1058; A.R. *Argon.* 1.937; Mnasalc. AP 7.54.1 = HE 18.1.

some of them reveal the presence of a more engaged poet, who made some effort to be original, at least in the content.¹⁰³

Although in *AP* 7.228 it is not clearly stated that the owner of the tomb, Androtion (a name that would fit well in the fourth century BCE, even though the epitaph seems to be imperial), was a soldier, the fact that the epitaph is located in a thematic Meleagrean section between two epigrams related to the army—that is, Diotimus *AP* 7.227 (an epitaph for Crinagoras) and Dioscorides *AP* 7.229 (a fictitious epitaph-narrative for the Spartan Thrasybulus)—suggests that at least the compiler thought that this piece belonged in this category. Moreover, the inscriptional evidence quoted in this section confirms that most of the dovecote tower tombs were built from the savings of *militia*. Was the compiler drawing material from some collection of thematically arranged military epitaphs, including both literary and inscriptional pieces? It remains a mystery how what seems to be a stock product of the inscriptional market found its way into an anthology of literary epigrams; nor it is clear through which collection it came to the attention of Cephala, or of the later compiler of the *Greek Anthology*. Equally problematic would be the opposite hypothesis that a presumed Meleagrean Hellenistic anonymous epitaph, such as *AP* 7.228, one that was not even attributed to a famous poet, became a model for dozens of inscriptional epigrams on Middle Eastern *Grabturmen* of the Roman imperial period.

7. CONCLUSION

In the *aition* of the tomb of Simonides (fr. 64 Pf.), Callimachus teaches readers (of his poem and of grave inscriptions alike) that the poet's disembodied voice lives on even after his tombstone has been destroyed. This is certainly an ambitious aim for a modest inscriptional epitaph. Nonetheless, the concept of immortal virtue celebrated by a poem that becomes independent from the stone carrying it is already present in archaic poetry, and is also one of the most frequent features in epitaphs during the Hellenistic period; when the poem is learned by heart or copied in books, the fame it conveys disengages itself from the material support of the stone. Equally common is the motif of the speaking stone, which we saw in Anyte (*AP* 7.724.3–4)¹⁰⁴ and which is vividly used in the honorific inscription for Asclepiodotus, from

¹⁰³ SGO IV 22/15/02 (Busr al-Hariri, Nabataea, fourth century CE), SGO IV 22/21/01 (Colonia Sakkaia Maximianopolis, fourth century CE).

¹⁰⁴ See p. 155 in this chapter.

Aphrodisias (SGO I 02/09/05, c.480 CE):¹⁰⁵ there the inscription states that, even when the marble (of the building that he restored, or of the inscription celebrating him) will be eroded through the passing of time, the benefactor's glory will survive: *τήκει καὶ πέτρην ὁ πολὺς χρόνος· ἀλλ' ἄ[ρετάων] | Ἀσκληπιοδότου τὸ κλέος ἀθάνατον* ('Long time wears away even stone; but the fame of Asclepiodotus' virtues is immortal', vv. 5–6).¹⁰⁶ Indeed, this inscription (actually the second quatrain out of the two) found its way into the *Greek Anthology* (as anon. *AP* 9.704).

The distinction between purely literary epigrammatists and professional versifiers of inscriptions who worked only on commission is not so clear-cut. On the one hand, either a famous poet who could count kings and queens among his patrons, such as Posidippus, or a more modest epigrammatist, such as Damagetus, could have composed a dedicatory or a funerary epigram for a community or for an individual, and then collected (or hoped that someone else would collect) his own epigrams in a book. On the other hand, purely inscriptional epigrams of high poetic quality or of particular historical interest could be copied in monographs on local history or in private anthologies by professional poets or simply by cultivated individuals interested in this poetic genre. Therefore the hope that an inscriptional epitaph could survive longer than its marble support was not per se totally unreasonable. Anyte's definition of her epitaph as a 'stone that sings an *epos*' (*AP* 7.724.3) could be legitimate also in a scenario in which her poem was not fictitious but meant to appear on a soldier's grave (ironically, in the *Greek Anthology* a textual corruption has made the deceased's name uncertain). A survey of individual epitaphs for Hellenistic or Roman soldiers of the Greek East shows that, among the plethora of mass-produced epitymbian poems, some diamonds, even in the rough, can be found. However, none of them survives in the literary sources handed down to us from antiquity. This does not mean, of course, that they were not copied in private anthologies or in the professional versifiers' 'sample books': unfortunately books can perish as well as stones.

Furthermore, not only are epigrams for individual soldiers from the Hellenistic and Roman eras not present, with very few exceptions, in the *Greek Anthology*, but also the subgenre of 'epitaphs for individual soldiers' never became popular as a literary theme.¹⁰⁷ For military subjects, the epigrammatists preferred narratives on Spartan warriors rejected or praised by their mothers and fictitious epitaphs for epic heroes or famous historical

¹⁰⁵ Honorary–funerary inscription in elegiacs, on a marble block, which was found at Aphrodisias.

¹⁰⁶ Translation by C. Roueché; visit <http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/ala2004>.

¹⁰⁷ Compare a modern epigrammatic collection, the *Anthology of Spoon River*, where the epitaphs devoted to war are only six. Edgar Lee Masters published the first poems in 1914, and the collection between 1915 and 1916. The war-related poems are the following: Knowlton Hoheimer, Lydia Puckett, Jacob Goodpasture, Harry Wilmans, John Wasson, and Many Soldiers.

figures of the past. It is quite ironical that, among a vast choice of curious and interesting Hellenistic inscriptional epigrams related to the army, the only two inscriptional military epitaphs preserved in the *Greek Anthology* belong to the category of anonymous, customarily produced pieces.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Gianfranco Agosti, Christelle Fischer-Bovet, Valentina Garulli, and Ruben Post for giving me access to their unpublished papers; I also thank the conference participants for their useful comments.

Tears and Emotions in Greek Literary Epitaphs

Doris Meyer

*Die differenzierte Analyse der Gefühle durch Aristoteles weist auch der Literatur und Kunst eine zentrale Rolle in der Gesellschaft zu, die weit über einen bloßen ästhetischen Genuß hinausgeht. . . . Aufgabe der Kunst ist, abstrakt unbestimmte und dadurch oft gefährliche Gefühle zu konkret bestimmten, ihren Gegenständen gegenüber angemessenen Gefühlen zu kultivieren.*¹

Enactive readers progressively transform an affective theme across striking or evocative passages, becoming implicated in the existential concerns embodied in those passages.²

1. INTRODUCTION

Starting from the two statements on literature and emotions cited above—the first one from the point of view of *Kulturgeschichte* (‘cultural history’ and ‘the social history of emotions’), the second from the perspective of reader-response theory—I shall investigate the function and role of emotions in Greek literary epigrams. It is a well-known and almost banal assumption that literature and literariness have something to do with emotion, and this is particularly true when literary critics—ancient and modern—are dealing with poetry. But how can we know what people of the past felt when reading poetry, especially epigrams? The emotional vocabulary of the ancient Greeks is

¹ Schmitt (2008), 261: ‘The detailed analysis of emotions by Aristotle also assigns a central role to literature and art within society, which goes far beyond mere aesthetic pleasure. . . . It is the function of art both to define concretely emotions that are abstract, general, and thus often dangerous, and to cultivate them in order that they become emotions that are appropriate within specific existing realities.’

² Miall and Kuiken (1999), 136.

not the same as ours.³ Was there a difference between the archaic or classical viewer who read a verse inscription on a stele and Hellenistic or later readers who ‘consumed’ the refined poems of a book of epigrams? We shall certainly never know what other people really feel, let alone felt, but we can try to give some answers as to the role the ancient Greeks assigned to emotional elements in literary or poetical communication. To this end, I focus on the literary representation of the partners interacting in communication—authors and readers of epigrams—and on the principal medium for emotional interaction: the poetical language of epigram and the poet’s art. As a guideline, I use the two assumptions involved in the quotations that open this chapter: (1) poetry was considered in ancient Greece to ‘cultivate’ in some way emotions that were important for a certain social group, with the poets claiming an active role in the process of ‘emotional sharing’ or the ‘cultivation of emotions’; (2) classical readers responded to literary texts by re-enacting emotions that were not only individual but also ‘social’.⁴ For practical reasons, I confine my study (which can only give some first glimpses into a large field of research) mainly to the poetical representation of grief and mourning in certain funerary epigrams, while confronting poems that belong to different historical contexts and periods. But let us begin with some definitions essential for this kind of research:

(a) ‘From a perspective of neuroscience, emotion is a fundamental property of the brain and is instantiated in distributed circuitry that enables emotion to interact with other major mental functions such as attention and memory’.⁵

(b) ‘Emotions are elicited when something happens that the organism considers to be of *relevance*, by being directly linked to its sensitivities, needs, goals, values, and general well-being. . . . In most cases emotion-evoking events require the organism to react, which often implies suspending ongoing behaviour and engaging in a new course of action’.⁶

These two modern definitions describe the psychological phenomenon that Greek philosophers used to call *pathos* (πάθος),⁷ which they usually discussed

³ On methodological problems, see the excellent remarks of Chaniotis (2012b), 11–36 and Konstan (2006), 4–17.

⁴ For the social character of *individual* and religious emotions in classical antiquity, see Scheid (2013), 77–81 and 210–11.

⁵ Davidson (‘emotion definitions [neuroscience perspectives]’) in Sander and Scherer (2009), 141–2. The authors cited here and in the following footnote discuss different opinions as manifested in actual research; see also Gordon (‘emotion definitions [philosophical perspectives]’), in Sander and Scherer (2009), 142, for the history of the concept of emotion. For a very useful introduction to the whole theme, see Sander and Scherer (2009).

⁶ Frijda and Scherer (‘emotion definitions [psychological perspectives]’) in Sander and Scherer (2009), 142–3.

⁷ Plural *πάθη*; ‘of the soul, *emotion*, *passion*’ (LSJ s.v. *πάθος*); Christoph Rapp (2005).

in the context of verbal art, be it the inherent emotive qualities of poetical language or the rhetorical strategies by which verbal artists hoped to influence the *psyche* ('soul' or 'mind') of their audience.⁸ Just like psychologists of our own time, ancient philosophers and rhetoricians of the classical period were especially interested in the cognitive dimension of emotion in connection with other mental faculties of the individual, and particularly the process of decision-making before taking action.⁹ In Hellenistic poetry and art, however, a character is defined not only by his or her actions but also—indeed, even more so—by his or her emotional state.¹⁰

In his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle defines emotions as 'everything that makes people change their mind and have different opinions and is accompanied by pain and pleasure: for example, anger, compassion, fear, and all that is similar and their opposites' (ἔστι δὲ τὰ πάθη δι' ὅσα μεταβάλλοντες διαφέρουσι πρὸς τὰς κρίσεις οἷς ἔπεται λύπη καὶ ἡδονή, οἷον ὀργή, ἔλεος, φόβος καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα, καὶ τὰ τούτοις ἐναντία, 1378a20–3).¹¹ Pleasure and pain can be explained by the fact that emotions, like desires, are forms of appetite (*orexis*) that can be satisfied or left unfulfilled.¹² In the context of the *Rhetoric*, it is not surprising that Aristotle stresses the role played by emotions in social interaction.¹³ As has often been argued, his writing on emotions is really about persuasion and how to do things with emotive words;¹⁴ it bears witness to a society marked by rivalry in which social roles are negotiated permanently and publicly.¹⁵ Even if grief and sadness are not submitted to psychological analysis in the *Rhetoric*,¹⁶ we learn from funerary epigrams and from the monuments themselves that emotions that accompany the loss of a member of the community have a social as well as a 'cognitive' dimension, which lies in the (re-)evaluation of the

⁸ The most important study of the emotions that we possess from classical times is Book 2 of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, analysed in detail by Konstan (2006); cf. Sistakou (2014), 135–9; Christoph Rapp (2005); Schmitt (2008).

⁹ Konstan (2006), 20–3 emphasizes the parallels between modern psychological science and the Aristotelian theory of emotions; for the important cognitive approach or 'appraisal theory', see Scherer ('emotion theories and concepts [psychological perspectives]') in Sander and Scherer (2009), 145–51; according to Schmitt (2008), 261, Aristotelian emotions are *Begleitformen von Erkenntnis*.

¹⁰ See e.g. the characters in Herodas' *Mimiambi*; for the expression of *ethos* and *pathos* in Hellenistic visual arts, see Prioux (2011).

¹¹ See Konstan (2006), 27–40, esp. 33. The *stimuli* or *ictus* ('stings', 'strokes') become still more important in the Stoic theory of emotion; see Schmitt (2008), 258.

¹² Arist. *de An.* 403a2–b19, 432a15–3b30, and esp. 432b29–3a3; Cates (2003); Schmitt (2008), 251–3.

¹³ See Konstan (2006), 34.

¹⁴ See e.g. *ibid.*, 27–8.

¹⁵ See *ibid.*, xii–xiii, 27–8, and 75–6. See also Scheid-Tissinier (2012), 268–70 and 286–9, with bibliography.

¹⁶ According to Konstan (2006), 245–7, there was for Aristotle a terminological problem and a conceptual one: (1) 'grief is the equivalent of *λύπη*, not an emotion itself but an associate of emotion, like pleasure' and (2) 'it involves no judgment of intentions, no reckoning of relative power, no reference to desert or to social status' (247). But cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1995).

social status of the dead and his or her family as well as in awareness of the frailty of human existence.¹⁷ This principle also applies to the Aristotelian definition of pity or compassion (*eleos*), the social or 'shared' emotion par excellence.¹⁸

Aristotle is also interested in the emotional effects produced by poetical language and literary texts, particularly in fictional narrative. Outside the primary context of court oratory, he explores the emotions shared by spectators in the theatre, as we know from his famous remarks on tragedy in the *Poetics*.¹⁹ Nevertheless, it is in the *Rhetoric* that we find the most detailed analysis of how poetical language acts upon the *psyche* of a listener or reader. Metaphor, for instance, even if it is often used in everyday language, is a marker of poetic texts, in which it functions as a vehicle for cognitive-emotional learning.²⁰ Aristotle argues that, in literature, successful metaphor is one of the instruments by which the aesthetic effect is produced, especially as far as emotions or 'aesthetic feelings' are concerned.²¹

More generally, the philosopher's theoretical reflections deal with the process of appropriation of emotions carried out by the listener of a speech or the reader of a text. Aristotle, refining Gorgias' approach,²² introduces the idea of a 'sympathetic effect' created by the orator's verbal art in the *psychai* of the listeners, while rational thought (*dianoia*) comes to be neutralized. In the end, the orator and his public find themselves in a comparable, 'sympathetic'

¹⁷ See Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 178–9: 'the sorrow and grief caused by the deceased's death was also part of his social persona . . . the recording of these emotions also entailed the recording of this validation. . . . The expression of grief and sorrow at the deceased's death was a record of his importance, so the theme can be considered as part of the category of praise'; and cf. 292. For modern explanations, see e.g. Stroebe and Stroebe (2009), 199: 'Grief is understood to be primarily an emotional (affective) reaction but it also incorporates diverse psychological (cognitive, social-behavioural) and physical . . . components.' The cognitive element of mourning has been underlined by Nussbaum (2001), 39; for a critical revision, see Cates (2003).

¹⁸ Arist. *Rh.* 1358b13–15; see Nussbaum (2001), 306; Cates (2003), 334–8.

¹⁹ For a recent interpretation of emotion in the *Poetics*, seen as an essential part of the process of comprehension ('emotional understanding') and comparable to the cognitive approach to emotion in the *Rhetoric*, see Halliwell (2011), 208–65; Schmitt (2008).

²⁰ See Arist. *Rh.* 1404b5–5a10, with Christoph Rapp (2002), 2: 830–2; and Arist. *Rh.* 1411b22–12a10, with Christoph Rapp (2002), 2: 525, 810–11, 821, 862–3, and 940–1. See also Kövecses (2000). Metaphor as a means of emotional expression in everyday language is analysed from a linguistic point of view in Theodoropoulou (2012), 451–60. For the emotional force of metaphor, achieved especially through 'foregrounding' (the use of unusual elements that appeal to the reader's emotions), see the helpful remarks of Miall and Kuiken (1999, 122; 2002) and Miall (2003). For metaphor and poetry, see Asper (1997), 12–18; for examples in literary epigrams, see Kanellou (2013).

²¹ See Arist. *Po.* 1457b6–33, 1459a4–8; *Rh.* 1404b26–5a10, 1410b9–36; and cf. Schmitt (2011), 363. See also Miall and Kuiken (2002); Kövecses (2000); Robinson ('aesthetic emotions [philosophical perspectives]') and Silvia ('aesthetic emotions [psychological perspectives]') in Sander and Scherer (2009), 6–9.

²² See Halliwell (2011), 266–85; Sistikou (2014), 136.

psychological status.²³ The conceptualization of emotional sharing as well as the cognitive approach to psychological phenomena, a concept that assigned a positive function even to the irrational, was certainly known to the epigrammatists of the third century BCE. As has often been observed, Hellenistic poets show themselves to be especially sensitive to psychological questions, and the highly elaborate theoretical framework with which Aristotle provided them certainly helped them in their social role as ‘cultivators of emotion’ and developers of listener- or reader-oriented verbal strategies.²⁴

2. GREEK EPIGRAM AND THE ‘HISTORY OF EMOTIONS’

The description or *mise en scène* of emotions in Greek epigrams can be studied in two different but complementary ways: epigrams are poetry and, as a literary genre, they assign a specific place to emotion in the generic framework defined by tradition. ‘The emotion seeks to be expressed’;²⁵ and theorists agree that poetry can give emotion a form, allowing the expression of private feelings as well as the sharing of public emotions by means of a common poetical language.²⁶ Inscriptional epigrams of the archaic and classical times appealed to the emotions of an ‘average’ reader standing in front of a monument.²⁷ Literary epigrams, which means short poems aiming by design at book readers, refine and develop the rhetorical instruments used in inscriptions in order to move readers, who may be distant in space and time and,

²³ The ‘sympathetic effect’ of emotional speech (*pathetike lexis*) is described at Arist. *Rh.* 1408a19–25: *συνομοπαθεῖ ὁ ἀκούων ἀεὶ τῷ παθητικῶς λέγοντι* (‘the listener always sympathizes with the one speaking emotionally’). The ‘sympathetic’ response does not depend on *dianoia* (*παραλογίζεται γὰρ ἢ ψυχῇ*, ‘for the mind reaches a wrong conclusion’) but is based on a ‘mirror effect’: the spectator–listener and the orator are placed in a comparable psychological state (in ancient musical theory, the same effect is achieved by the different keys or modes). The same principle applies also to the ‘convincing narrative’, see p. 188 n. 69 in this chapter. One might compare modern ideas about the function of emotional sharing, e.g. in Rizzolatti and Sinigaglia (2008), and about how feelings accompany the reading of fictional texts; see Miall and Kuiken (2002).

²⁴ On the influence of Plato and Aristotle on Hellenistic poetry, see Sistakou (2014), 135–9; on Hellenistic philosophy and its influence, see *ibid.*, 152–3. The role of *phantasia* is underlined by Männlein-Robert (2007b), 100–3. Even Plato accepted tears and excitement when hearing poetry or orations, on condition that it contributed to self-recognition and the improvement of character; see Baumgarten (2009).

²⁵ Theodoropoulou (2012), 433.

²⁶ See e.g. Hunter (2010), 271–2 on this function of poetical language; Chaniotis (2012a) for inscriptional epigrams.

²⁷ Cf. Chaniotis (2012a), 97: ‘pain and sorrow, pride for extraordinary achievements, envy, love, friendship, affection, anger for a violent or undeserving death, hope for a good afterlife; they offer consolation, they advise the reader to feel joy in life; they restrain the expression of grief.’

what is more, conscious of the possibly fictive nature of the text. These (post-classical) readers of literary epigrams do not share in the protagonists' emotions, which are often depicted as extreme and overwhelming, so much as they are invited to have *aesthetic* feelings. Post-classical readers experiment with all sorts of sensations, and it is not surprising that the visual aspects of a given text as well as the musicality of poetry become more and more important in evoking emotions in readers. Nevertheless, as we shall see, at the beginning of this evolution 'from emotion to sensation' in the third century BCE,²⁸ the best authors of epigram still count on empathy and compassion to achieve the affective connection between the protagonists in their poems and the contemporary reading public.²⁹

This is the reason why, as a second step, ancient theories of emotion as well as the epigrammatists' literary strategies can be supplemented by the socio-cultural approach of emotional history. This field of research is relatively new and is based on the idea that the social sharing of emotions helps to build the identity of the social group insofar as emotions can be seen as sociocultural constructions that may develop and change in the course of time.³⁰ It is especially interesting to see how poets of different times interpret their role as *agents* in this process of social sharing of emotions, but also how they conceive of the emotional response of their 'ideal' reader.³¹

3. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF READING: EPIGRAMS AND COGNITIVE PROCESSES

The act of reading and understanding an inscription or the object that the inscription accompanies is an effective way to explain the function and the *raison d'être* of the monument.³² Nevertheless, even if we take into account

²⁸ Sistikou (2014).

²⁹ Extreme emotion is to be found primarily in erotic epigrams; empathy is a characteristic of the multiple shipwreck epigrams (see p. 183 in this chapter). The modern term 'empathy' is explained by Decety (2009), 151 ('empathy [neuroscience perspectives]') thus: '(1) an affective response to another person, which often . . . entails sharing that person's emotional state, and (2) a cognitive capacity to take the subjective perspective of the other person.' See Decety (2009), 91 for the Aristotelian pity/compassion (*eleos*) and, at a more technical level, for the sympathetic effect of shared emotions. For a cognitive interpretation of compassion, see Nussbaum (2001) and the remarks of Cates (2003); for 'epic' compassion (Achilles and Priam in Homer), see Scheid-Tissinier (2012), 275.

³⁰ See primarily Chaniotis (2012b), esp. 16–17; Chaniotis and Ducrey (2013); also Scheid-Tissinier (2012); Konstan (2006), ix–xii and 12–40.

³¹ For the communicative function of emotion, see Chaniotis (2012b), 28–31; Theodoropoulou (2012), 445; also Bormann and Wittchow (2008).

³² See e.g. Walsh (1990); Meyer (1993); Bing (1995); G. Zanker (2004); Meyer (2005); Männlein-Robert (2007b); and compare Hunter (2010), 273.

the viewer's or the reader's emotional responses in some archaic epigrams,³³ the rational element seems to be predominant in Hellenistic epigrams; fictive speakers show extraordinary intellectual capacities when interpreting funerary or dedicatory 'inscriptions'.³⁴ But even here the cognitive processes are accompanied by the arousal of emotions. Callimachus realistically depicts the little moments of hesitation, emotional insecurity, and surprise that occur while the speaker reads a sepulchral inscription:

‘Τιμονόη’. τίς δ’ ἐσσί; μὰ δαίμονας, οὐ σ’ ἄν ἐπέγνων,
εἰ μὴ Τιμοθέου πατρὸς ἐπὶν ὄνομα
στήλη καὶ Μήθυμνα, τεῖ πόλις. ἦ μέγα φημί
χῆρον ἀνιᾶσθαι σὸν πόσιν Εὐθυμένη.

(Call. AP 7.522 = HE 40)

‘Timonoe’. Who are you? By god, I would not have known you,
if your father’s name, Timotheus,
and your city, Methymna, had not been on your tomb. I say,
your husband, Euthymenes, bereft of you, must be in great grief.³⁵

However, the strongest feelings are assigned to the deceased woman’s next of kin. By constructing the situation this way, Callimachus puts the accent on both the author’s and the reader’s social role (vv. 3–4); it is empathy and emotional sharing with those who are the most concerned that connects people regardless of geographical location and time.

4. THE PROBLEM OF ‘LITERARY EMOTION’

Interest in psychology (or emotions) is a characteristic of Hellenistic poetry in general. Erotic epigram, the successor of archaic love poetry, mirrors every kind of pain and passion. Intellectual poets like Callimachus and Posidippus knew of the philosophical debates about *eros* and self-control as well as about the theories of art and emotion, as mentioned earlier in this chapter.³⁶ Despite the interest that Hellenistic poets show in the emotional

³³ See *καλὸν τὸ μνημα* (‘beautiful (is) the monument’) with Meyer (2005), 78. Emotion establishes the connection between viewer and object; see Männlein-Robert (2007b), 103. Today the emotions accompanying the reading and understanding of texts are the object of discourse-processing research; see e.g. the studies of Miall and Kuiken (2002); Miall (2003).

³⁴ See Meyer (2005), 121–4; Männlein-Robert (2007b), 127–40; Prioux (2007), 244–56. See also the literate connoisseur of iconography in Asclep. or Posidipp. *API* 68 = *HE* 39 = 141 A–B. For the relationship between inscribed and literary epigrams, see e.g. Day’s chapter in this volume.

³⁵ Translation from Gutzwiller (1998), 201, slightly modified.

³⁶ Konstan (2006), 31 argues that the distrustful atmosphere at the Alexandrian court helped intellectuals to develop their competences in psychological interpretation.

life of individuals, there is a strong focus on the common, or even universal, experience of emotion. By sharing emotions and insisting on empathy, literary funerary epigrams of the third century BCE re-create—in a new, ‘bookish’ context—the atmosphere of the sociocultural community of the archaic and classical Greek *polis*.³⁷

Epigrammatic emotions, however, are not exempt from the process of literalization. In a recent article, Evina Sistakou has shown how emotions are deconstructed and fragmentized to set pieces in Hellenistic literature; furthermore, because of their intertextual relations, they become ‘literary emotions’.³⁸ Their models for expressing emotion are to be found on monuments (grief, compassion) as well as in lyric (*eros*), dramatic, and epic poetry (pain, grief).³⁹

From the beginning of the third century BCE onwards, the mode of ‘circulation of emotions between interactants’⁴⁰ changes, partly as a result of altered literary practices. In other words, an empathic circulation of emotions is now enabled by the circulation of books. It is perhaps not surprising that empathy for people who suffered or died, such as shipwrecked individuals, becomes a major theme.⁴¹ Thus Callimachus, in his famous Heraclitus epigram (AP 7.80 = HE 34), finds consolation in poetry by commemorating a friend who died a long time ago. This is not a written version of ritual lament, an epigrammatic scheme that we often find in archaic epitaphs.⁴² Here grief is personal and spontaneous, but at the same time ‘literary’. The vocabulary employed recalls the tragic vocabulary of Euripides⁴³ and Odysseus’ emotional

³⁷ See especially the ‘we’ addressed to the community in Call. AP 7.517 = HE 32 and AP 7.519 = HE 44, as well as in Posidipp. 44 and 55 A–B; see also Ambühl (2002); A. Petrovic (2015), 209.

³⁸ See Sistakou (2014), 152, who observes: ‘genuine emotion, such as the grief for the deceased and unrequited love, is reserved for the miniature narratives of the epigram.’ As we shall see, even grief can be qualified as a ‘literary’ and not always a ‘genuine’ emotion in epigrams. For the question of literariness in epigram, see also Hunter’s important contribution in this volume.

³⁹ Inscriptional epigram of archaic and classical times also borrows from epic and lyric poetry; see e.g. Hunter (2010); Vestrheim (2010), 75–8.

⁴⁰ Plantin and Traverso (2000), 14.

⁴¹ For this type of epigram, see Tueller’s chapter in this volume. Death far from a community is seen as an event belonging to the history of this community; Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 288 describes it as ‘a moment in the history of the community whose continuity gives meaning to individual discontinuity’. Homer makes clear that people feel grief for one another by comparing the fate of others to their own destiny (Il. 19.301–2, 19.337–8; see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 422). This is why the reader’s response in a *naugikon* composed by Callimachus (δακρύσας ἐπὶ κληρον ἑὸν βίον, ‘weeping for his own perishable life’, AP 7.277.3 = 50.3 HE) is also a ‘literary’ emotion; moreover, it conforms to the Aristotelian definition of compassion (see n. 29 in this chapter).

⁴² For the difference, see Suter (2009), 59–61; Day (1989); for emotions and lamentations in inscribed epigrams, see Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 174–9. Modern psychology distinguishes between ‘grief’ and ‘mourning’ (public expressions of grief and related practices); they are, however, interconnected, see Stroebe and Stroebe (2009).

⁴³ Cf. Call. AP 7.80.1–2 = HE 34.1–2, ἐς δέ με δάκρυ | ἤγαγεν (‘moved me to tears’) and E. Alc. 1081 (Heracles), τὸ γὰρ φιλήσαι τὸν θανόντ’ ἄγει δάκρυ (‘for to love the deceased brings on tears’), Tr. 1130–1, Ἀνδρομάχη, πολλῶν ἔμοι | δακρύων ἀγωγός (‘Andromache having drawn many tears from me’). For the difference between grief and other emotions in Aristotle and for further examples from tragedy, see Konstan (2006), 244–58 (246–8 on ‘social’ emotion).

state when listening to Demodocus' song and weeping 'like a widow who sheds tears over her deceased husband'.⁴⁴ So allusions to epic poetry and tragedy turn the emotions expressed in this epigram—which has impressed so many modern readers—into 'literary emotions'.⁴⁵

5. EMPATHY AND EMOTIONAL CONTROL IN LITERARY EPITAPHS OF THE THIRD CENTURY BCE

The expression of private and personal feelings in a literary funerary epigram for a friend is a Callimachean innovation.⁴⁶ The focus is on emotional communication, not on ritual, and the epigrammatic voice resembles more the voice of the lyric poet who addresses a friend than public lamentations. This literary strategy is typical of third-century BCE epigrams, where inscripti-
onal and literary voices are combined and fused; as for the expression of emotions, we perceive the voices of lyric, tragic, and epic poets behind the falsely anonymous epigrammatic speaker.⁴⁷ In 50 A–B, Posidippus addresses the whole *polis*, sharing in the grief of a family that has lost a daughter:⁴⁸

κύνεον νέφος ἦλθε δι' ἄστεος, ἡνίκα κούρη
τοῦθ' ὑπὸ σῆμα τιθεῖς ἔστενεν Ἡετίων,
ἀγκαλέων Ἡδεῖαν ἐὼν τέκος, ἥς Ὑμέναιος
ἡρίον οὐ θαλάμου χερσὶν ἔκοιψε πύλην·
συμπαθὲς⁴⁹ ἄλγ[ος ἔην πάση] πόλει, ἀλλὰ τὰ κεινῶν⁵⁰
ἀστῶν ἀρκε[ίτω δάκρυ]α καὶ στοναχαί.

(Posidipp. 50 A–B)

5

⁴⁴ Ταῦτ' ἄρ' αἰοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς | τήκετο, δάκρυ δ' ἔδενεν ὑπὸ βλεφάροισι
παρείας. | ὥς δὲ γυνὴ κλαίῃσι φίλον πόσιν ἀμφιπεσοῦσα ('Thus this song the famous bard sang.
But Odysseus was moved to tears, and made wet his cheeks with the tears falling from under his
eyelids. And as a woman cries having fallen upon and embracing her dear husband', *Od.*
8.521–3).

⁴⁵ See Meyer (2005), 221–2. The theme of distance and separation is already present in
Homeric scenes of personal mourning; see Tsagalis (2004), 2–8 (γῶος = 'personal lament(s)
uttered by individuals closely related to the deceased', 7) and 75–90; Föllinger (2009), 20–1. For
the reworking of small-scale genres in epigrams of the third century BCE, see also Harder's
chapter in this volume.

⁴⁶ On the traditional 'anonymous first-person mourner', see Day (1989); Meyer (2005), 77–83.

⁴⁷ See, however, e.g. Vestrheim (2010) for the connection between the epigrammatic voice
and the lyric voice in pre-Hellenistic epigrams; Hunter (2010), 284 gives an example of the tragic
voice in epigram.

⁴⁸ See Hunter (2010), 278–84; A. Petrovic (2015), 207–11; Harder's chapter in this volume.

⁴⁹ Edited text and translation by Austin and Bastianini (2002), 72–3. Συμπαθές: *ibid.* –
ευπαθές: papyrus and A. Petrovic (2015) – ἐμπαθές?: Lloyd-Jones (2001).

⁵⁰ κεινῶν: Austin and Bastianini (2002). Cf. κείνων (Lloyd-Jones 2001) and κεινά (Gronewald
2001), which 'both seem improvements', as Hunter (2010), 282 n. 43 argues.

A black cloud came over the city, when Hetion
 placing the maid under this gravestone lamented her,
 calling by name Hedeia, his own child, at whose tomb Hymenaeus
 knocked with his hands, not at the door of her chamber.
 The [whole] town joined in sympathetic grief. But suffice for now
 the [tears] and lamentations of the bereaved citizens.⁵¹

Inscriptional topoi employed in this epigram include the relatives' lamentations, the address of the deceased by name, the parallelism between marriage and death, the reference to the wedding chamber, and the 'house of Hades'.⁵² The motif of grief affecting the whole town can already be found in Archilochus (fr. 13 W)⁵³ and in archaic Greek *polyandria*, but it has been reinterpreted in an innovative way by Posidippus: it is not the death of young warriors who died for their city that is publicly honoured with a monument, but a family's personal tragedy.⁵⁴ The citizens' grief is not the result of war and does not have a political significance for the community—at least not at first glance—but seems above all to reflect compassion, a very humane response. In typical Hellenistic fashion, Posidippus describes the social psychology of compassion as if he had witnessed the burial and experienced the grief himself.

Precision or 'realism' in the description is achieved through the use of two expressions. To begin with, the very first words of the poem recall a Homeric formula used in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* when gods save a warrior by enveloping him in a 'dark cloud' (κυάνεον νέφος or κυανέη νεφέλη in the *Odyssey*).⁵⁵ At the narrative level the Homeric cloud is to be interpreted as a real thing. On the contrary, in Bacchylides' *Epinician Ode* 13.31 Irigoin and in an epigram ascribed to Simonides, the κυάνεον νέφος is used as a metaphor whose *tenor* is death itself (θανάτου). Let us look at the latter:⁵⁶

⁵¹ Perhaps 'But suffice the tears of these citizens' or 'But suffice the empty tears'. Hunter (2010), 282 only slightly modifies the translation of Austin and Bastianini (2002), 73: 'but may the tears and laments of the bereft citizens suffice'.

⁵² For the importance of names in inscribed funerary epigrams, see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 291–306. For parallels between marriage and death, the wedding chamber and Hades, see *S. Ant.* 816; *E. Med.* 985, *IA* 461, 1109, *IT* 369; Harder's chapter in this volume. For the house of Hades, see Schmitz (2010b), 38; Bowie (2010), 362, 373, and 392.

⁵³ See p. 187 in this volume.

⁵⁴ See Hunter (2010), 282–3, and cf. 278–83 for epigraphic parallels and 'Anacr.' *AP* 7.226 = *FGE* 134 as a possible model. On *Il.* 24.707–8 and 24.789 (lamentations for Hector's death) as models for all later poets, see Hunter (2010), 280–1; for the *pothos* motif in epigrams, see Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 171 and 375.

⁵⁵ *Il.* 5.345, 16.66, 23.188; *Od.* 12.405, 14.303. Plutarch explains the phrase at *De sollertia animalium* 978B5.

⁵⁶ The date of the epigram (set before Meleager) and the related battle are unknown; see Page (1981), 199–200. This epigram is of a type characteristic of Simonides' age; see *ibid.*, 200. For the notions of *tenor* and *vehicle* in metaphors, see Asper (1997), 12–18.

ἄσβεστον κλέος οἶδε φίλῃ περὶ πατρίδι θέντες
 κυάνεον θανάτου ἀμφεβάλοντο νέφος·
 οὐδὲ τεθνᾶσι θανόντες, ἐπεὶ σφ' Ἀρετὴ καθύπερθε
 κυδαίνουσ' ἀνάγει δώματος ἐξ Αἴδεω.

(‘Simon.’ AP 7.251 = FGE 9)

These men having brought ineffaceable glory to their dear fatherland
 were veiled by the dark cloud of death.

Though they died, they are not dead; Virtue, through the glory
 which she gives them, leads them up, from above, out of the house of Hades.⁵⁷

In this epitaph typical for men who have fallen in battle, ‘Simonides’ brings us into the heroic and masculine world of Homeric warriors, whose death is recompensed by eternal glory. This is not, though, the case in Posidippus’ epigram where the *κυάνεον νέφος* describes the emotions aroused by a young girl’s death. The dark cloud is neither a divine covering nor a metaphorical visualization of death; it is a depression that invades the town as a whole, like a fog. In addition, the metaphorical use of *νέφος* (which stands for grief) is certainly inspired by another famous intertext: Achilles’ lamentation for Patroclus at *Iliad* 18.22–7.⁵⁸ The words in which Homer expresses grief, τὸν δ’ ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα (‘a dark cloud of pain enwrapped [Achilles]’, *Il.* 18.22; cf. *Il.* 17.591), differ slightly, however, from the formula *κυάνεον νέφος* used by Posidippus and the lyric poets (Bacchylides and Simonides). Posidippus, a third-century *poeta doctus*, certainly knew that the adjective *κυάνεος* was used in the hexametric poetry of the archaic era for the garments of mourning women. At *Iliad* 24.94 Thetis wears a dark-blue veil while mourning Achilles, and Demeter does the same as she weeps for her daughter: *κυάνεον δὲ κάλυμμα κατ’ ἀμφοτέρων βάλετ’ ὤμων* (‘the dark-blue cloak she cast down from both shoulders’, *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 42).⁵⁹ Hence we can suggest that, in Posidippus 50.1 A–B, *κυάνεον νέφος* functions as a double vehicle for the ideas of intense grief (Achilles) and female mourning (Thetis, Demeter), the emotion being ‘epic’ and ‘literary’, yet at the same time also a ‘real’ psychological state.⁶⁰ For some readers, the metaphor may highlight an opposition: in marked contrast to the Homeric or the Simonidean warriors, the young girl is not saved, as can happen in epic poetry, nor does she acquire eternal glory.

⁵⁷ The text and the translation (slightly modified) for vv. 3–4 are from Page (1981), 200.

⁵⁸ See Föllinger (2009), 24–5 and 31–2.

⁵⁹ Cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 182–3, 319, 360, and 374; Richardson (1974), 163–4. See Hes. *Th.* 406.

⁶⁰ One imagines Hedeia’s mother covering her head with a dark veil. In Homer, however, this garment is reserved for divine women. During the discussion over a first version of this chapter, Andrej Petrovic proposed to me to interpret *κυάνεον νέφος ἦλθε δι’ ἄστεος* (v. 1) as standing for the procession of mourning women wearing dark clothes and travelling through town; cf. A. Petrovic (2015), 208. For Achilles as a model for ‘epic’ mourning, see Scheid-Tissinier (2012), 267–8.

In the last line of Posidippus 50 A–B, the poet decrees in an almost abrupt manner that the mourning should stop (ἀρκε[ίτω δάκρυ]α καὶ στοναχαί, ‘suffice for now the [tears] and lamentations’). This is perhaps a typical epigrammatic formula,⁶¹ but it also reminds us of the archaic poet cultivating ‘civic’ emotion on the occasion of the aristocratic banquet. In a comparable way, Archilochus’ elegiac fragment 13 W addresses Pericles and a group of citizens.⁶² What is more, Posidippus himself composed an ‘autobiographical’ elegy that recalls funerary epigram and in which he gives reasons for *not* weeping: ‘and let no one shed a tear’ (μηδέ τις οὐδὲν χεύει δάκρυον, 118.24 A–B = SH 705.24), he tells us, because the initiated enjoy a blessed existence after death.⁶³ Posidippus’ philosophical and religious tendencies—which led him to stage his poetic persona as a *mystes*, and certainly as someone inspired by Stoicism⁶⁴—may be the reason behind the rigorous interdiction of excessive grief. Be that as it may, a philosophical interest clearly marks the psychological explication that the poet gives in the penultimate line of poem 50 A–B. Συμπαθὲς ἄλγ[ος] (‘pain shared by way of compassion’) is a quasi-medical expression; it is used in prose and could even be characterized as ‘modern’, when compared to the complex epideictic associations of the dark-blue cloud metaphor.⁶⁵

Kathryn Gutzwiller is certainly right to emphasize the importance of ties between family and community in Posidippus’ work. Thus the theme of familial and social connections could account for the numerous *epitymbia* dedicated to women.⁶⁶ Following this line of thought, the *κυάνεον νέφος* in Posidippus 50 A–B on the dead Hedeia constitutes a social reinterpretation of the old heroic metaphor. By insisting on shared emotion (*sympatheia*), the poet stages himself as one of those who consolidate social coherence. Literary tradition and intertextuality are part of the poet’s strategy; they function as a literary code addressed to those who are capable of interpreting a Homeric

⁶¹ See Gutzwiller (2004a), 89; Hunter (2010), 283; A. Petrovic (2015), 209–10. Cf. Posidipp. 60.3 and 61.3 A–B.

⁶² See Föllinger (2009), 31–2; Baumgarten (2009), 86 n. 4.

⁶³ Gutzwiller (2004a, 89; 2005a, 295). For δάκρυα χέειν and κλαίειν (‘shedding tears’, ‘lamenting’) as the two expressions that Homer uses mostly for private mourning, see Föllinger (2009), 20.

⁶⁴ See Gutzwiller (1998, 157–62; 2005a, 305); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 75.

⁶⁵ Συμπάθεια is a medical and philosophical term (Stoic but not exclusively so), used in physiological and psychological contexts; see LSJ s.v. συμπάθεια. Expressions such as τὰ κατὰ συμπάθειαν ἀλγήματα (‘pain transmitted from one organ to another by interconnection’) can be found in Galen (e.g. *In Hippocratis aphorismos commentarii* VII, vol. 18.1 Kühn, p. 35, l. 4). It is perhaps not a coincidence that Posidippus shows an interest in medicine, as demonstrated by his *Iamatika* (Remedies); according to Diogenes Laertius, φασὶ δ’ εἶναι καὶ τινὰς δαίμονας ἀνθρώπων συμπάθειαν ἔχοντας, ἐπὶ πάντας τῶν ἀνθρωπείων πραγμάτων (‘also they hold that they are demons who are in sympathy with mankind and watch over human affairs’, D.L. 7.151; translation from Hicks 1925, 2: 255). For ἀλγηδών as a Stoic term for physical pain, see Konstan (2006), 245–6.

⁶⁶ See Gutzwiller (2005a), 294.

metaphor with a ‘modern’ instrument.⁶⁷ At the same time, the poet reveals himself to be a master of his art, as he is consciously using the emotional force of a poetic metaphor that also functions independently of the reader’s erudition.⁶⁸

To sum up, we can say that, on the one hand, in the epigrams that we have examined so far the third-century elite poets show themselves to be specialists in aesthetic feelings; they use the techniques of metaphorical expression as well as a convincing narration.⁶⁹ On the other hand, they take an active part in the control and creation of social emotions (as we may deduce from the obvious allusion to tradition), in a continuation of the role of aristocratic poets in the archaic period.⁷⁰

6. SATIRICAL, BUCOLIC, AND BIBLICAL TEARS IN ROMAN IMPERIAL AND LATE ANTIQUE EPIGRAMS

Lucillius, who wrote satirical epigrams (some of them were dedicated to Emperor Nero),⁷¹ was fond of ridiculing contemporaries who practised their profession badly.⁷² Among the victims of his mockery, we find a self-proclaimed poet called Marcus, whose epigrams are so poor that they make their readers cry. It is not difficult to understand that, when Lucillius quotes Marcus’ ‘inscription’ *‘κλαύσατε δωδεκέτη Μάξιμον ἐξ Ἐφέσου’* (‘weep for twelve-year-old Maximus from Ephesus’, *AP* 11.312.4 = 116.4 Fl^b), he parodies the formulae of funerary inscribed epigrams, especially the invitation addressed to the anonymous passer-by to feel pity and reproduce ritual lamentations (*threnoi*).⁷³ However, in stone epigrams *κλαίειν* seems to be limited to the description of the mourning of the deceased’s family and friends.⁷⁴ Most of the texts collected by Hansen (*CEG* I and II) use *οἰκτίρειν* (‘feel pity’, ‘have

⁶⁷ See Hunter (2010), 271–2.

⁶⁸ This is what we can infer from the special interest that Posidippus and Callimachus exhibit for psychological processes. See Hunter (2010), 273 on literary epigrams that focus on the interpretation of a monument by a reader: ‘This interest in process . . . goes hand in hand with the way in which poetic imagery is actually used.’

⁶⁹ Cf. Hunter (2010), 283–4 on the extraordinary narration in Call. *AP* 7.517 = *HE* 32. On the emotive effect of the ‘convincing narration’ in Aristotle, see Christoph Rapp (2002), 2: 862–3 and Arist. *Rh.* 1417a36–b7, with Christoph Rapp (2002), 2: 977 (on *diegesis*); Krämer (1992), 249. For epigram and narration in general, see Bowie (2010).

⁷⁰ For the philosophical background, see Nussbaum (1994), esp. 78–101 (chapter 3: ‘Aristotle on Emotions and Ethical Health’).

⁷¹ For biographical information about Lucillius, see V. Longo (1967), 9–16; Nisbet (2003), 16–19, 36–81, and 101–36, but see the remarks in Gutzwiller (2005c) and Floridi (2014a), 3–8.

⁷² For this category of skoptic targets, see Brecht (1930), 2–51; Nisbet (2003), 33–5.

⁷³ See Day (1989), 20–7; Brecht (1930), 15–16; Floridi (2014a), 494–9. *Κλαύσατε* is also the opposite of the friendlier *χαίρετε* by which readers are addressed, as Floridi (2014a), 499 argues.

⁷⁴ See for instance *CEG* 97 (late fifth century BCE).

compassion') to denote the action required of the anonymous passer-by.⁷⁵ Worse still, the imperative aorist *κλαύσατε* ('cry', 'weep') used by Marcus in Lucillius AP 11.312.4 is not attested at all in inscribed epigram, and in the *Greek Anthology* *κλαύσατε/κλαῦσον* is found only here in Lucillius and in some funerary epigrams composed by Gregory of Nazianzus (fourth century CE).⁷⁶ The term *κλαύσατε* does not belong to first-century CE poetic diction and its use reveals the ignorance of the bad poet Marcus, who nevertheless had Homeric ambitions; as we have seen, it was an accomplishment for the epic singer to make his audience cry.⁷⁷ Marcus may move passers-by to tears the way Demodocus' song made Odysseus cry (*Od.* 8.83–92, 521–31),⁷⁸ but ironically Marcus' inscription achieves this effect only owing to the poor quality and vanity of his words (*εἰς δ' ἐπίδειξιν | ποιητοῦ κλαίειν τοῖς παριοῦσι λέγω*, 'but to show off the poet's talent I bid the passer-by weep', vv. 5–6).⁷⁹

In contrast to most of Callimachus' and Posidippus' poems, Lucillius uses a relatively simple, we could even say prosaic, language. His attacks on corporal, moral, or intellectual deficiencies draw on other traditions of literary invective, such as Menippean satire and Catullus' *Carmina*.⁸⁰ But it is also the parody of funerary inscribed epigram as a means of satire that makes us understand better the cultural context of Lucillius' skoptic epigram. First of all, the thematic connection between death and false intellectualism recalls a contemporary of Lucillius: Petronius. Petronius, who was also associated with Nero's court, describes a banquet where self-proclaimed poets improvise epigrams of astonishing banality (*Satyricon* 55.3) and polemicizes professions and different types of intellectuals (poets, doctors, and philosophers, *Sat.* 55.4–6.7). The satirist also ridicules a person who cries excessively and hypocritically makes his whole *familia* weep, citing an epitaph that he composed for himself (*Sat.* 71.12–2.1).⁸¹ The common theme of the Latin *Satyricon* and of Lucillius'

⁷⁵ E.g. CEG 27–8; cf. Day (1989), 20 and 27, who thinks of elegy and funerary ritual (*threnos*); Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 176, on the contrary, accepts the original sense of *οἰκτίρειν* ('feel pity'). Besides *οἰκτίρειν*, we find *ὀλοφύρεσθαι* and *ἀνιάσθαι*.

⁷⁶ There is no example of *κλαύσατε/κλαῦσον* in CEG I and II (verse inscriptions that go up to the fourth century BCE). According to the TLG, the imperative aorist makes an appearance only in the *Septuagint* and late Greek.

⁷⁷ See p. 184 in this volume. See also Call. AP 7.80 = HE 34; and, for Homer's use of *κλαίειν* for the tears of grief, anger, and desperation, see Föllinger (2009), 20–1. Homer is an important point of reference in other Lucillian epigrams.

⁷⁸ See Baumgarten (2009). This is why Plato was reticent about the educational utility of poetry; see Halliwell (2011), 155–207.

⁷⁹ Translation from Paton (1916–18), 4: 215. This becomes clear from Lucillius' second epigram, which mocks Marcus (AP 11.135); see the series of comparable subjects in AP 11.132–7; Brecht (1930), 31–2; V. Longo (1967), 66–70. According to Nystrom (2004), the last line contains a pun (*κλαῦσον* = 'go away'); see Floridi (2014a), 499.

⁸⁰ On Roman satire and 'satirical' emotions, see W.-W. Ehlers (2008).

⁸¹ As Petronius insinuates, the tears are false and provoked by the vanity of the 'author' (*iactatio*, *Sat.* 73.2).

Greek satirical epigrams is indeed that of false emotions, criticized from the point of view of popular moral philosophy. For the readers of Lucillius' epigrams, literature is used primarily for a kind of comic entertainment that is based on witty exaggeration, paradoxes, and punchlines. The protagonists' emotions are observed from a distance, just as one observes the excitement of comic actors in a scene.

My last author takes us even deeper into the world of 'literary emotions', which are linked here to a new type of funerary epigram. In AP 8.129 Gregory of Nazianzus combines the *elogium* ('eulogy') of a beautiful garden with mourning for a certain Euphemius.⁸² This is one of three epigrams in which Gregory uses the imperative aorist *κλαύσατε*, an unknown or rare verbal form in earlier Greek poetry, as we have already seen.⁸³ The garden epigram fuses the peaceful atmosphere of a *locus amoenus* with the melancholy of an epitaph, signalled by the motifs of sleep and tears and the allusion to glory beyond death. Verses 1–2 (*κρῆναι καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἄλσέα, καὶ λαλαγεῦντες | ὄρνιθες* 'springs, rivers and groves, and singing birds that twitter')⁸⁴ apparently imitate Theocritus' first idyll, whence perhaps the choice of *κλαίειν* in such a context; in *Idyll* 1, which also inspired the image of musical nature (vv. 1–3), wild animals weep over the dead Daphnis. Even the lion sheds tears for him (*ἔκλαυσε*, *Id.* 1.72).⁸⁵ Following the traces of Hellenistic bucolics,⁸⁶ Gregory composed a variant of 'pathetic fallacy', conferring human emotions to nature. However, Gregory was also very familiar with the Bible, in which tears and scenes of lamentation are a common place. The fact that the verbal form *κλαύσατε* is well attested in the *Septuagint*⁸⁷ but not in classical poetry may be a sign of new literary influences. This is only a hypothesis; but, if we examine the situation at hand from the perspective of 'emotional history', we can perhaps suggest that the two epigrams, one imperial and one late

⁸² On garden epigrams, see the chapter by Smith in this volume.

⁸³ Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus AP 8.206, *τύμβοι καὶ σκοπιαί, καὶ οὔρεα, καὶ παροδίται, | κλαύσατε τύμβον ἐμόν, κλαύσατε τυμβολέτην· | ἦχῳ δ' ἐκ σκοπέλων πυματηγόρος ἀντιαχείτω | τῶνδε περικτιόνων· 'κλαύσατε τυμβολέτην'* ('Tombs, and summits, and hills, and passers-by, weep for my tomb and weep for its destroyer. And may echo, that repeats the last words, cry from these neighbouring hills, "weep for the destroyer"'); text edited and translated by Paton 1916–18, 2: 488–9) and his AP 8.249.1–2, which betray the same 'bucolic' origins and mood as AP 8.129. See also his AP 8.189.1.

⁸⁴ Translation from Paton (1916–18), 2: 457.

⁸⁵ See also Theoc. *Id.* 20.36 (Adonis), *Id.* 23.34, 38, and 55; Bion of Smyrna *Adonis*.

⁸⁶ On Gregory's use of the classical poetic tradition, see Demoen (1993).

⁸⁷ Cf. e.g. Jeremiah 22.10, *μὴ κλαίετε τὸν τεθνηκότα μηδὲ θρηνεῖτε αὐτόν· κλαύσατε κλαυθμῷ τὸν ἐκπορευόμενον, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιστρέψει ἔτι καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδῃ τὴν γῆν πατρίδος αὐτοῦ* ('Weep not for him who is dead, nor grieve for him, but weep bitterly for him who goes away, for he shall return no more to see his native land'). In the Book of Job 31.38, we find the same motif of a weeping nature: *εἰ ἐπ' ἐμοί ποτε ἡ γῆ ἐστέναξεν, εἰ δὲ καὶ οἱ αὐλακες αὐτῆς ἔκλαυσαν ὁμοθυμαδόν* ('If my land has cried out against me and its furrows have wept together'). Translations from biblical texts are from *ESV* (<https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/English-Standard-Version-ESV-Bible>).

antique, are not only an *imitatio* of classical models but also—just like the other epigrams analysed in this chapter—a product of the emotional culture of their own time.⁸⁸

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must thank Maria Kanellou, Adam Gross, as well as Ulrike and Jochen Althoff for their comments and their help with English language.

⁸⁸ For ‘cultural symbiosis’ in Gregory’s epigrams, especially the Christian interpretation of bucolic motifs, see Mossay (2009).

Sea and Land

Dividing Sepulchral Epigram

Michael A. Tueller

From their very beginning, sepulchral epigrams prominently featured the theme of division and separation, be that the gulf that separated the living from the dead or the division of the body from the soul. Later epigrammatists developed this theme, emphasizing or bridging such divisions as they responded to the agonistic epigram tradition that preceded them. As we shall see in this survey of the idea of separation in sepulchral epigram, the boundary between the sea and the land came to play an important part in this competition. The oldest strand in the development of this theme is the separation of the living from the dead.

1. THE LIVING AND THE DEAD

Before there were sepulchral epigrams, there were sepulchres, such as the ones marked by the uninscribed *semata* that we see in the *Iliad*.¹ According to Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, ‘the first important function of the grave monument is to seal and mark the burial space, to complete and mark its closure as well as its position, and so testify to the separation of the deceased’s remains, shade, and social persona, from the world of the living’.² The idea of separation is thus prior to epigram. These monuments, however, naturally acquired a second function: to memorialize the deceased person. As long as the community remembered that person and his or her burial, the monument

¹ Most memorably at *Il.* 7.89, though the effect of their lack of inscription is better seen in other examples, such as *Il.* 2.814 and 23.331. See also Tueller (2012).

² Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 109.

on the tomb could perform that function.³ It is at this time that it becomes useful for a grave to bear an inscription naming the deceased: then knowledge of the deceased could outlast those who knew him or her, and passers-by would not require the intervention of a local interpreter if they wished to discover who was buried there. Many of the earliest sepulchral epigrams do little more than reveal this name.

But this memorial function has already begun to bridge the boundary of death. A marker that had begun as a representation of absence became a marker that connected the community of the living to a person on the other side of death's boundary.⁴ A few epigrams attempt to justify this reconciliation:

πάντων ἀνθρώπων νόμος ἐ|στὶ κοινὸς τὸ ἀποθανέν. : |
 ἐνθάδε κείται Θεοίτης παῖς | Τελέσωνος Τεγεάτας Τεγε|άτο :
 καὶ μητρὸς Νικαρέτης | χρηστῆς γε γυναικός. :
 χαίρε|τε οἱ παρι|όντες, ἐγὼ δέ γε τὰ|μὰ φυ|λά|ττω.
 (CEG 487, Piraeus, beginning of the fourth century BCE)

Death is the common law of all humans.

Here lies Theoitēs of Tegea, son of Teleso of Tegea
 and of his mother, Nicarete, an excellent woman.

Passers-by, farewell! As for me, I guard my own.⁵

The first verse of this epigram reframes death, not as something that divides, but as something that unites: it is common to every human. The final verse, however, admits that the dividing function is still operative. Its two clauses separate neatly at the caesura. The first dismisses the passers-by, telling them to go their own way, bidding them farewell, and admitting that they are still on the move. The second clause, then, shows how the dead are the opposite: they must stay in place; the stone will keep them where they are. Death thus remains a boundary, but it is, paradoxically, a boundary that is open to all.

Other early epigrams preferred to accentuate this separation. One easy way to do this was to make the boundary of death coincident with spatial separation. Burial in a foreign land became an irresistible theme; it separated the deceased not only from the living but also from the community that would remember them. The famous community of Eretrians marooned in Persia provides the subject for the following epigram, probably an early instance of the theme.⁶

³ Ibid., 117–19.

⁴ See e.g. CEG 13, 28, 470.

⁵ All translations of epigrams are my own.

⁶ Page (1981), 171–2, traces Greek interest in this group, and particularly in their burials. Other examples of the theme include Agath. AP 7.552, Antip. Thess. AP 7.185 = GPh 16 and AP 7.390 = GPh 62, AP 7.398 = GPh 65, Bass. AP 7.372 = GPh 3, Crin. AP 7.376 = GPh 16, Diog. bishop of Amisus AP 7.613, Dionys. AP 7.78 = HE 1, Leon. AP 7.715 = HE 93, Mnasalc. AP 7.54 = HE 18, Paul. Sil. AP 7.560, Theoc. AP 7.660 = HE 12, and Theodorid. AP 7.722 = HE 11.

*Εὐβοίης γένος ἐσμὲν Ἐρετρικόν, ἄγχι δὲ Σούσων
κείμεθα· φεῦ, γαίης ὅσσον ἀφ' ἡμετέρης.
(‘Pl.’ AP 7.259 = FGE 11)⁷*

We are originally Eretrians from Euboea, but near Susa
we lie. O! How far we are from our land!

The power of this theme may be seen from this example:

*Ἑρμιονεὺς ὁ ξείνος, ἐν ἀλλοδαπῶν δὲ τέθαπται,
Ζωῖλος, Ἀργεῖαν γαῖαν ἐφρυσσάμενος,
ἂν ἐπὶ οἱ βαθύκολπος ἀμάσατο δάκρυσι νύμφα
λειβομένα παιδὲς τ' εἰς χροά κειράμενοι.
(Hegesipp. AP 7.446 = HE 4)*

Zoilus, the stranger from Hermione, lies buried among foreigners,
wrapped in Argive earth, heaped upon him
by his weeping deep-bosomed wife
and his children with hair cut close.

As Gow and Page point out, the separation here is exaggerated, since Hermione is part of the Argolid.⁸ The epigram, in its second couplet, admits as much because, though the man was buried *among* foreigners, his entire family was present at the burial. The irony here is poignant: Hegesippus introduces the idea of distance to reinforce the separation of death, but then, by minimizing that distance, he provokes the realization that death constitutes a great gulf even when the burial is not that far off.⁹

In this scheme, death at sea holds a peculiar place. The earliest evidence frames death at sea as a species of ‘bad death’, in which the deceased has not received the ordinary ritual observances, most especially burial.¹⁰ Hellenistic epigram, however, moves to introduce burial—or at least the idea of burial—into the epigrams of shipwreck victims.¹¹ In these epigrams, the sea then plays

⁷ Edited texts from Beckby (1957–8) and from Austin and Bastianini (2002).

⁸ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 301.

⁹ The same point is made, with a different kind of irony, by Callimachus in AP 7.520 = HE 33; there he implies that the distance of death may be bridged by simply knowing the deceased’s ‘address’ in the Underworld.

¹⁰ Sourvinou-Inwood (1983), 43 addresses the evidence of epic; Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 288 digests the evidence of early grave monuments. See also Georgoudi (1988); Campetella (1997–8).

¹¹ Epigrams emphasizing death at sea without explicitly invoking burial (though many of these epigrams use some burial language): Antip. Thess. AP 7.286 = GPh 14, Eryc. AP 7.397 = GPh 8, Heraclid. Sinop. AP 7.392 = GPh 2, Leon. AP 7.283 = HE 63, Pers. AP 7.501 = HE 4, and Phil. AP 7.382 = GPh 25. Epigrams (in addition to the examples below) combining actual burial with death at sea: Antip. Thess. AP 7.287 = GPh 58, Arch. AP 7.278 = GPh 12, Call. AP 7.277 = HE 50, and Theodorid. AP 7.282 = HE 19. Epigrams combining the notion of burial with death at sea (including cenotaphs): Marc. Arg. AP 7.374 = GPh 19 and AP 7.395 = GPh 20, Asclep. AP 7.500 = HE 31, Call. AP 7.272 = HE 38, Damag. AP 7.497 = HE 9, Euphorion AP 7.651 = HE 2, Gaet. AP 7.275 = FGE 6, Glauc. AP 7.285 = HE 2, Honest. AP 7.274 = GPh 22, Jul. Aegypt.

a role more closely allied to the idea of spatial separation. On the one hand, the sea simply extends generic spatial separation: it introduces a barrier that is more difficult to overcome than mere distance. On the other hand, death at sea introduces another separation: it splits the deceased's name from the body. Epigrammatists approached this topic from two angles:

ναυηγόν με θανόντα καὶ ἔκλαυσεν καὶ ἔθαψεν
 Λεώφαντος σπουδῇ, καὺτὸς ἐπειγόμενος
 ὥς ἂν ἐπὶ ξείνης καὶ ὁδοιπόρος· ἀλλ' ἀποδοῦναι
 Λεωφάντῳ μεγάλην μικκὸς ἐγὼ χάριτα.
 (Posidipp. 94 A–B)

Leophantus bewailed and buried me, a dead shipwreck victim,
 in haste, though he too is pressed on
 like a wayfarer in a foreign land. But I am
 (too) small to return great thanks to Leophantus.

ὥφελε μὴδ' ἐγένοντο θοαὶ νέες· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἡμεῖς
 παῖδα Διοκλείδew Σώπολιν ἐστένομεν·
 νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν εἰν ἀλί που φέρεται νέκυς, ἀντὶ δ' ἐκείνου
 οὐνομα καὶ κενεὸν σῆμα παρερχόμεθα.
 (Call. AP 7.271 = HE 45)

If only there were no swift ships! Then we would not
 be mourning Sopolis, son of Diocleides.
 But now his corpse is adrift somewhere on the brine, and instead of
 the man himself we pass by his name and an empty tomb.

The Posidippus epigram represents the rarer case in which a body is found and buried on the shore. Its name is unknown, and this fact is implicitly connected to the dead man's inability to interact properly with his burier, or even with the reader: without a name and a connection to a homeland, he cannot say the things that he acknowledges need to be said. The Callimachus example is the more usual case, where a sailor has been lost at sea. The concept of distance is introduced in the third verse. In a sense, the distance to Sopolis' body is infinite because that body cannot be located; it is only 'somewhere on the brine' (v. 3). But more striking is the fourth verse, where Callimachus points out that the absence of the body makes the tomb empty, bearing as it does only a name.¹²

The most obvious way to bridge this gap is simply to reunite the name and the body—or so it would seem. Some epigrams try doing this:

AP 7.591–2, Leon. AP 7.273 = HE 62, AP 7.652 = HE 15 and AP 7.654 = HE 16, Pers. AP 7.539 = HE 9, and 'Simon.' AP 7.496 = FGE 68. The theme is exceedingly common, and this listing is scarcely complete. For a more comprehensive catalogue of epigrams dealing with the theme, see Goyens-Slezakowa (1990–1), 124–6.

¹² Asclep. AP 7.500 = HE 31 doubly reinforces the idea of distance; in that poem, even the cenotaph is distant from the deceased's homeland.

ναυτίλοι, ἐγγὺς ἀλὸς τί με θάπτετε; πολλὸν ἄνευθε
 χῶσαι ναυηγού τλήμονα τύμβον ἔδει.
 φρίσσω κύματος ἤχον, ἐμὸν μόνον. ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως
 χαίρετε, Νικήτην οἷτινες οἰκτίσατε.

(Posidipp. AP 7.267 = HE 15 = 132 A–B)

Sailors, why are you burying me near the sea? Far away
 one should pile the tomb of a long-suffering shipwreck victim.
 I shiver at the sound of waves, my doom: but, even so,
 farewell, you who took pity on Nicetes.

The epigram gives the drowned man a name, but it does so without any indication of how that name came to be known. The ancient reader would surely have been surprised by this revelation, which is delayed to the last verse. This epigram shows how closely the boundary between sea and land was associated with the separation of body and name. Before Posidippus produces Nicetes' name, he shows that sea and land have also come unnervingly close together: the sound of the waves is heard even in the tomb on land.

Realistically, the problem of the nameless body is not solved simply by bringing the body to land; the body must somehow be connected to a land where the name is known, that is, to the deceased's homeland. Hellenistic epigrammatists devised various solutions. In one epigram by Posidippus (93 A–B), there is a prayer that the drifting body may be cast ashore on the coast of his homeland, and Leonidas of Tarentum composes an epigram in which this actually happens (AP 7.665 = HE 14). Hegesippus (AP 13.12 = HE 6) gives us the most likely possibility: a shipwrecked corpse is cremated in a foreign land and returned home in an urn.¹³

Other epigrams give more detailed, if not necessarily more convincing, narratives designed to bring sea and land burial closer together. First, as can be seen in the Nicetes epigram (Posidipp. AP 7.267), death at sea is not per se incompatible with burial on land, as long as one is not too picky about the precise place where the body is buried or about how close it is to the sea. A shipwreck victim buried on the shore has received, serially, burial both in water and in earth.¹⁴ He also receives a parallel burial in both, as a seaside burial is liminal between land and sea.

But at the same time the nearness of the sea threatens a more literal, physical violation of the boundary represented by the shoreline. In Diocles

¹³ Even more realistically, all that might return home would be news of the deceased, as we see in Apollonid. AP 7.631 = GPh 7.

¹⁴ It is easy to see how a corpse sunk in the sea is parallel to one buried in the earth; some later epigrams make the parallel explicit: τύμβενέ μ' ἐλοῦσα καθ' ὕδατος ('seize and entomb me in the water', Phil. AP 7.382.5 = GPh 25.5); γαῖα γὰρ αἰδομένη λιτῶ μέγαν ἀνέρα χῶσαι | σήματι τῷ πόντῳ μᾶλλον ἔδωκεν ἔχειν ('for the earth, ashamed to inter a great man in a paltry tomb, rather gave him to the sea to hold', Jul. Aegypt. AP 7.591.3–4). See also Marc. Arg. AP 7.374 = GPh 19 and Eryc. AP 7.397 = GPh 8, which apply to the sea language ordinarily pertaining to burial.

of Carystus (AP 7.393 = *GPh* 1), the corpse is buried, then exhumed by the action of the pounding surf; the deceased tires of the process and insists that going unburied on land would be preferable.

Bianor composes the most striking variation on the idea of the sea encroaching on the land:

ιχθύσι καὶ ποταμῷ Κλειτώνυμον ἐχθρὸς ὄμιλος
 ὤσεν, ὅτ' εἰς ἄκρην ἦλθε τυραννοφόνος.
 ἀλλὰ Δίκη μιν ἔθαψεν· ἀποσπασθεῖσα γὰρ ὄχθη
 πᾶν δέμας ἐς κορυφὴν ἐκ ποδὸς ἐκτέρισεν·
 κείται δ' οὐχ ὑδάτεσσι διάβροχος· αἰδομένα δὲ
 Γᾶ κεύθει τὸν ἑᾶς ὄρμον ἐλευθερίας.

5

(Bianor AP 7.388 = *GPh* 3)

The hostile crowd consigned Cleitonymus to the fish and the river,
 when he came to the citadel intent on tyrannicide.
 But Justice buried him; for the bank collapsed
 and interred his whole body, from foot to head.
 Now he lies unsoaked by the water; and, out of respect,
 Earth hid the harbour of her freedom.

Here everything is reversed: Cleitonymus, whose very name insists that he deserves to be remembered, is supposed to be 'buried' in water (thus being dishonoured, since a 'burial' in water is not a proper burial), but this time the *land* encroaches on the water, claiming his body and keeping it safe from any dampness. The border between land and water is further obscured by the fact that the man is called a *ὄρμος*, 'harbour'; this harbour is then preserved by being kept on dry land.

Some epigrammatists attempt even more complex interchanges between water and land. Antiphilus of Byzantium, for instance, assigns the following words to a dolphin:

ἀνέρα θήρ, χερσαῖον ὁ πόντιος, ἄπνοον ἔμπνοος,
 ἀράμενος λοφιῆς ὑγρὸν ὑπερθε νέκυν
 εἰς ψαμάθους ἐκόμισσα· τί δὲ πλέον; ἔξ ἀλὸς εἰς γῆν
 νηξάμενος φόρτου μισθὸν ἔχω θάνατον·
 δαίμονα δ' ἀλλήλων ἡμεΐψαμεν· ἡ μὲν ἐκείνου
 χθὼν ἐμέ, τὸν δ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἔκτανε τοῦμόν ὕδωρ.

5

(Antiphil. AP 9.222 = *GPh* 37)

Beast lifting man, sea creature lifting land creature, alive lifting dead,
 I carried a wet corpse on my back to the sands.
 And what good did it do? After swimming from the sea to the land,
 I have obtained death as the reward for my transport.
 We swapped fates: his land
 killed me, and my water killed the one from earth.

Antiphilus' entry into this theme is perhaps too insistent: the epigram seems more of a lesson than a poem. Nevertheless, the dolphin speaker gives it an

ironic touch: for this speaker, the land represents death as surely as the sea does for the man whose body he recovered.¹⁵

For Antiphilus, the unstable border between land and sea held a fascination that went beyond burial and the dead:

αἰγιαλοῦ τενάγρῃσιν ὑποπλώοντα λαθραίῃ
 εἶρεσίῃ Φαίδων εἴσιδε πουλυπόδην·
 μάρψας δ' ὠκύς ἔριψεν ἐπὶ χθόνα, πρὶν περὶ χεῖρας
 πλέξασθαι βρύγδην ὀκτατόνους ἔλικας·
 δισκευθεὶς δ' ἐπὶ θάμνον ἐς οἰκία δειλὰ λαγωοῦ
 εἰληδὸν ταχينوῦ πτωκὸς ἔδησε πόδας·
 εἶλε δ' ἀλούς· σὺ δ' ἄελπτον ἔχεις γέρας ἀμφοτέρωθεν
 ἄγρης χερσαίης, πρέσβυ, καὶ εἰναλῆς.

5

(Antiphil. AP 9.14 = *GPh* 30)

Phaedo saw an octopus floating beneath the surface
 in the shallows by the shore, secretly paddling.
 He seized it swiftly and threw it onto the land, before
 it could entwine its eightfold coils tightly around his hands.
 It whirled onto a bush, into the cowering home of a hare,
 and fettered the feet of the swift timorous creature in its coils.
 The captive captured; old man, you have an unexpected gift
 from the fields of both the dry land and the briny sea.

Antiphilus employs the unusual octopus and hare scene to connect land and sea, the last couplet joining them as tightly as the octopus wrapped the hare.¹⁶ Not only do the two animals end up as a single ball of twisted feet; both also begin by skulking in hiding places, the octopus particularly marked as being in a liminal space. In fact, though the Greek can probably admit other meanings, the first two words of the poem (αἰγιαλοῦ τενάγρῃσιν) are most easily read as indicating that the octopus was found in a tidal pool, an ideal interface between land and sea.¹⁷

Sea and land, then, could meet in circumstances that do not involve shipwreck, or even a corpse. But, to return to the place where we began, the theme of a man drowned at sea had not exhausted its potential for variation. Some epigrammatists followed a different path, first by introducing yet

¹⁵ This poem has its roots in Anyte's contemplation of a beached dolphin, about which she speaks as if it were a shipwrecked sailor (AP 7.215 = *HE* 12). Antiphilus has rendered Anyte's idea more complex by introducing the contrapuntal theme of the land-dwelling man.

¹⁶ Probably due to the sheer unlikelihood of the scene, it attracted imitators: Bionor AP 9.227 = *GPh* 8 and Isid. Aeg. AP 9.94 = *GPh* 5. Antipater of Thessalonica (AP 9.10 = *GPh* 18) went one step farther, with an octopus that (willingly?) basks on the shore, only to encounter an eagle, a creature of the sky. The dates of poets who belong to Philip's *Garland* are often difficult to determine or overlapping. I have selected Antiphilus' poem only as the most illustrative; Antipater of Thessalonica may in fact give us the earliest example of the theme, though it is also the most complex.

¹⁷ Antip. Thess. AP 9.10.1–2 = *GPh* 18.1–2 seems to confirm the idea.

another obstacle to finding the corpse: the drowned man might not merely be adrift, as in Callimachus *AP* 7.271; he might be eaten by fish. Despite the difficulty, we have as many epigrams that attempt to overcome the barrier of the consumed corpse as we have epigrams that invoke it straightforwardly.¹⁸ The first is a fairly famous example composed by Leonidas of Tarentum:

κῆν γῇ κῆν πόντῳ κεκρύμμεθα· τοῦτο περισσὸν
 ἐκ Μοιρέων Θάρσους Χαρμίδου ἡνυσάμην.
 ἦ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀγκύρης ἔνοχον βάρος εἰς ἅλα δύνων
 Ἴόνιον θ' ὕγρὸν κύμα κατερχόμενος
 τὴν μὲν ἔσωσ', αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰτροπος ἐκ βυθοῦ ἔρρων,
 ἦδη καὶ ναύταις χεῖρας ὀρεγνύμενος,
 ἐβρώθην· τοῖόν μοι ἐπ' ἄγριον εὖ μέγα κῆτος
 ἦλθεν, ἀπέβροξεν δ' ἄχρῃς ἐπ' ὀμφαλίου.
 χῆμις μὲν ναῦται, ψυχρὸν βάρος, ἐξ ἁλὸς ἡμῶν
 ἦρανθ', ἡμις δὲ πρίστις ἀπεκλάσατο·
 ἦνι δ' ἐν ταύτῃ κακὰ λείψανα Θάρσους, ὦνερ,
 ἔκρυψαν· πάτρην δ' οὐ πάλιν ἰκόμεθα.
 (Leon. *AP* 7.506 = *HE* 65)

I am hidden both in land and in sea: this is the extreme
 fate that I, Tharsys son of Charmides, met.
 For diving into the briny deep after a fouled anchor,
 I descended into the wet Ionian swells.
 The anchor I freed, but, as I turned and left the depths,
 even as I was already reaching my arms out to the sailors,
 I was gobbled up: such a great savage monstrous fish
 came after me, and gulped me down up to the navel.
 Half of me, cold and heavy, the sailors pulled from the sea,
 and half the shark severed.
 On this beach, O man, the miserable remains of Tharsys
 they hid; I did not return to my homeland.

From the beginning, the epigram puts itself forward as a means to join the divided land and sea, and at first there seems some hope that all might go well. After all, there is no shipwreck here: the ship is whole, and it will be ready to return safely home as soon as the anchor is freed. The speaker, whose name—a derivative of *θάρασος* ('courage')—confirms his boldness, dives into the water, which might suggest the same kind of marriage between land and sea that is represented by the idea of a ship itself. But on the other hand the association of anchoring lines, a hook-like anchor, and submersion in water must also produce thoughts of fishing in the reader (as we shall see in Leonidas of

¹⁸ We see this theme pursued fairly straightforwardly in Gaet. *AP* 7.275 = *FGE* 6, Honest. *AP* 7.274 = *GPh* 22, and Leon. *AP* 7.273 = *HE* 62. Those who attempt some sort of resolution, in addition to the epigrams cited in the main text, include Tull. Laur. *AP* 7.294 = *GPh* 2 and Apollonid. *AP* 7.702 = *GPh* 12.

Tarentum AP 7.504 = HE 66): in this framework, the speaker is taking on the role of the live bait. Thus the sepulchral reconciliation of land and sea that is promised in the first verse is delivered only at the cost of a much more shocking division: that of the body itself. It is not buried in a single place that may be regarded as land and sea. Rather it is buried partly in land and partly at sea: a gruesome compromise.

A more realistic version of this scenario was composed by Antipater (probably of Thessalonica):

οὐδετέρης ὅλος εἰμὶ θανῶν νέκυσ, ἀλλὰ θάλασσα
καὶ χθών τήν ἀπ' ἐμεῦ μοῖραν ἔχουσιν ἴσην.
σάρκα γὰρ ἐν πόντῳ φάγον ἰχθύες, ὅστέα δ' αὖτε
βέβρασται ψυχρῇ τῇδε παρ' ἡϊόνι.
(Antip. 'Thess.' AP 7.288 = GPh 60)

I am a dead body not wholly of either place, but sea
and earth have an equal share of me.
For fish ate my flesh in the sea, but my bones
are tossed up on this cold beach.

Just like Leonidas AP 7.506, this epigram begins with the end, appraising the double burial. But, while Leonidas claimed burial 'both in land and in sea', Antipater is more concessive: the burial is 'not wholly of either place' (v. 1). While the body is evenly divided, just as it is for Leonidas, here the division is more subtle: not a body bitten in half at the navel, but flesh gnawed from bone.

These poems resolve the separation imposed by the land and sea boundary, but they do so at the cost of a much more radical separation, which takes place in the body itself. This can scarcely be regarded as a solution, and Hegesippus attempts to move beyond it:

ἐξ ἁλὸς ἡμίβρωτον ἀνηνέγκαντο σαγηνεῖς
ἄνδρα, πολύκλαυτον ναυτιλίας σκύβαλον·
κέρδεα δ' οὐκ ἐδίωξαν ἅ μὴ θέμις, ἀλλὰ σὺν αὐτοῖς
ἰχθύσι τῇδ' ὀλίγη θῆκαν ὑπὸ ψαμάθῳ.
ὦ χθών, τὸν ναυηγὸν ἔχεις ὅλον· ἀντὶ δὲ λουπῆς
σαρκὸς τοὺς σαρκῶν γευσάμενους ἐπέχεις.
(Hegesipp. AP 7.276 = HE 7)

5

Net fishermen drew up from the brine a half-eaten
man, the much lamented residue of a voyage.
They did not seek a profit that would not be decent, but
placed him, along with the fish themselves, under this little sand.
O Earth, you hold the shipwrecked man, all of him: in place of the rest of his flesh,
you have a hold on those that nibbled his flesh.

As in Antipater (AP 7.288), we have a contrast between half and whole. The man is half-devoured by fish, but this does not prevent a complete burial;

the fishermen, contravening their usual practice, do not sell the fish, because it 'would not be decent' (v. 3) given that these fish contain human flesh. Rather they bury the fish alongside what remains of their victim. This is the best bridge one could hope for in the circumstances.

The most outlandish variation on this fishy theme is also credited to Leonidas of Tarentum. As can be seen in the poems already discussed, the division between land and sea, which gives way to a division of the body itself, is paving the way for an opposition between men and fish. Resolving this opposition, which has led, in the previous passages, to dramatic episodes in which men died when bitten by fish, prompts the ironic epigrammatist's mind inevitably to the idea of men biting fish back:

*Πάρμις ὁ Καλλιγνώτου ἐπακταῖος καλαμευτής,
 ἄκρος καὶ κίχλης καὶ σκάρου ἰχθυβολεὺς
 καὶ λάβρου πέρκης δελεάρπαγος ὅσσα τε κοίλας
 σήραγγας πέτρας τ' ἐμβυθίους νέμεται,
 ἄγρης ἐκ πρώτης ποτ' ἰουλίδα πετρήεσαν 5
 δακνάζων ὀλοήν ἐξ ἀλὸς ἀράμενος
 ἔφθιτ' ὀλισθηρὴ γὰρ ὑπέκ χερὸς αἴξασα
 ὥχετ' ἐπὶ στεινὸν παλλομένη φάρυγα.
 χὼ μὲν μηρίνων καὶ δούνακος ἀγκίστρων τε
 ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ πνοιῶν ἦκε κυλινδόμενος, 10
 νήματ' ἀναπλήσας ἐπιμοίρια· τοῦ δὲ θανόντος
 Γρίπων ὁ γριπεὺς τοῦτον ἔχωσε τάφον.
 (Leon. AP 7.504 = HE 66)*

Parmis son of Callignotus, who plies his rod along the shore,
 a top-notch angler for wrasse, parrot-wrasse,
 the bait-snatching fighting perch, and all the fish
 that feed among the hollow overhangs and deep rocks,
 once, in his first catch of the day, drew out of the sea
 a deadly rock-dwelling rainbow wrasse,¹⁹ and bit it,
 and perished; for the slippery fish squirmed out of his hand
 and leapt into his narrow throat.
 He expelled his last breath as he rolled
 beside his lines, pole, and hooks,
 reaching the end of his fated thread. On the dead man
 Fischer the fisherman piled this tomb.

Of course, men bite fish all the time; that is the point of catching them, after all, so Leonidas must become creative to make his irony clear. He introduces the hapless Parmis, who hooks a fish that is not quite like his usual catch.

¹⁹ D. W. Thompson (1947), 91–2 so identifies the species. The lemmatist, however, describes it as a shellfish used for bait, *δέλεαρ ὀστρακῶδες*, presumably misinterpreting *πετρήεσαν* as 'hard-shelled' rather than 'rock-dwelling'. Olivieri (1949), 124 accepts the identification, though this leaves unexplained the phrase *ἄγρης ἐκ πρώτης*.

In fact it is an *λουλῖς*, a fish that is called ‘deadly’ (v. 6) in the poem because it was thought to have a poisonous bite.²⁰ Leonidas thus connects immediately to earlier ‘fish bites man’ poems; the reader expects that Parmis has met his fate in this fish. However, no sooner is the fish named than we see, not it biting Parmis, but Parmis biting it.

Here, as Parmis is mouth to mouth with a fish, Leonidas delivers the unexpected: the biting becomes swallowing, as the fish leaps down Parmis’ throat. The rainbow wrasse has pronounced bony dorsal and anal fins and, in a panicked slide down Parmis’ throat, it would inevitably have extended them. Man and fish come together in this poem in startling ways: they have exchanged biting habits, and the man, as he flops around amid his fishing gear, clearly behaves as a dying fish would do; his catch has become his bait, and his fish’s fins have hooked him.

2. THE BODY AND THE SOUL

Let us return now to the inscribed origins of epigram; the idea of some kind of split in the self is found already there. Many fourth-century inscribed epigrams characterize death as a separation between the *soma* and the *psyche*. In these epigrams the body is buried in the ground, while the soul departs, usually to the Underworld.²¹ This conception of death is traditional and can be traced back to Homer.²²

It is also possible, however, to speak of the person him- or herself descending to Hades; in this formulation the soul and the self must be considered equivalent. While this idea is also of long standing,²³ Plato gives it new prominence in the *Phaedo*: his ‘Socrates’ claims there that he himself, not merely his soul, will continue to exist after his death (*Phd.* 115d–116a).²⁴ In one sense, the assertion of Socrates here diverges only slightly from the more usual formulation. Although he dispenses with the word ‘soul’, he is still

²⁰ D. W. Thompson (1947), 91–2.

²¹ To the Underworld: see *CEG* 545, 548, 593, 737; into the *aether*: see *CEG* 10, 535; to Olympus: see *CEG* 558. This way of speaking about death was remarkably resilient; it is found, for instance, in Cometas *AP* 15.40.6–9, a ninth-century CE quasi-epigram on Lazarus. See Wypustek (2013), 42–7.

²² Bremmer (1983), 74; Sourvinou-Inwood (1983), 37–8; Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 56.

²³ Bremmer (1983), 77 explains that, at least as a kind of shorthand, even the *Iliad* can work along these lines. He also invokes anthropological comparanda showing the reach of the idea.

²⁴ The placement of these statements at the end of the *Phaedo* increases their impact, though the place of the soul in that dialogue remains problematic (see, for a brief explanation of some of the problems, Rowe 1993, 8–10). Plato’s Socrates, for instance, had taken as his starting point a definition of death as the *psyche*’s departure from the *soma* (64c), and also implies elsewhere (89b–c) that the surviving self is contained in a person’s *logos*.

thinking of death as a separation, in which the body goes into the ground. The innovation is to imply that no real harm was done: the essential person has survived. The idea of separation, while present, diminishes in importance; he prefers to emphasize continuity. We might expect this formulation to have an effect on the epigrammatic tradition after him. In fact, however, the signs are muddled:

γαῖα μὲν ἐν κόλποις κρύπτει τόδε σῶμα Πλάτωνος,
ψυχὴ δ' ἀθάνατον τάξιν ἔχει μακάρων.
(anon. AP 7.61.1–2 = FGE 1.1–2)²⁵

Earth hides Plato's body here in its bosom,
but his soul has an immortal place among the blessed.

The language of this poem is simple, which may lead us to postulate an early date for it. The sentiments, and even the wording, are almost wholly conventional.²⁶ The expressed attribution of immortality to the soul is relatively rare in the classical period, but there is possibly a contemporary example,²⁷ and similar expressions would become commonplace somewhat later.²⁸

The immortality of the soul in the anonymous AP 7.61 probably does have its roots in Plato's arguments for it in the *Phaedo*; but the poet does not follow the *Phaedo* so far as to claim the survival of the whole person. There are some epigrams that do this, but they are rare and late. Diogenes Laertius, for instance, briefly works through the line of reasoning in the *Phaedo*:²⁹

ἤθελες, ὦ Ζήνων, (καλὸν ἤθελες) ἄνδρα τύραννον
κτείνας ἐκλύσαι δουλοσύνης Ἑλέαν.
ἀλλ' ἐδάμης· δὴ γάρ σε λαβὼν ὁ τύραννος ἐν ὄλμῳ
κόψε. τί τοῦτο λέγω; σῶμα γάρ, οὐχὶ δὲ σέ.
(D.L. AP 7.129)

You chose, Zeno, (a good choice!) to kill the tyrant
and free Elea from slavery, but you were beaten;
the tyrant seized you and pounded you in a mortar.
But why am I saying this? It was your body, not you.

²⁵ The very similar *AP* 131 is attributed to Speusippus (= FGE 1) in the Planudean manuscript, but this is unlikely to be anything more than a guess (Page 1981, 306).

²⁶ Cf. *CEG* 545.1–2, 593.6–7. The precise wording τάξιν . . . μακάρων (v. 2) would, however, be out of place in the fourth century BCE.

²⁷ Hansen dates *CEG* 593 (see v. 7) between 346/5 and 338 BCE, quite close to Plato's death, if anon. AP 7.61 should be placed around that time, which is uncertain.

²⁸ Lattimore (1962), 28–36; Wypustek (2013), 42–53.

²⁹ Later, Agathias Scholasticus (*AP* 11.354) would do so much less briefly. Agathias even equates the self and the soul: his epigram is a search for the identity of the soul and concludes that, once you recognize yourself without your body, you have found the soul. I thank Joseph Romero for this reference.

Curiously, it is Zeno, not Plato, of whom Diogenes writes in these terms.³⁰

Coexisting with the inscribed tradition of the separation between body and soul at death is the tradition of the dead leaving behind a memory of themselves. This may not seem to be a parallel case at all; the memory of a dead person does not seem to be part of the self in the same way that a soul does. There are, however, two reasons to pair the body–memory split with the body–soul split. First, the survival of memory is sometimes mentioned in the same terms as the survival of the soul. Compare the following two epigrams:³¹

σῶμα μὲν ἐνθάδε σόν, Διονύσιε, γαῖα καλύπτει, |
ψυχὴν δὲ ἀθάνατον κοινὸς ἔχει ταμίας·

(CEG 593.6–7, Attica, between 346 and 338 BCE)

This earth covers your body here, Dionysius,
but the common warden holds your immortal soul.

[σ]ῶμα μὲν ἐν κόλποισι κατὰ χθών ἥδε καλ[ύπτει] |
[Τι]μοκλείας, τὴν σὴν δὲ ἀρετὴν οὐθεὶς [φθ]ίσει ἀ[ιών]· |
[ἀθά]νατος μνήμη σωφρ[ο]σύνης ἔνε[κ]α.

(CEG 611, Attica, fourth century? BCE)

This earth covers in its bosom the body of Timocleia,
but no age will diminish your virtue;
your memory is immortal because of your prudence.

Second, this persistence of memory is very similar to Plato's conception of the persistence of the person through his or her *logos*.³² In fact sepulchral epigrams about poets represent the best epigrammatic continuation of the ideas that Plato advanced in the *Phaedo*.³³ Callimachus' Heraclitus epigram (AP 7.80 = HE 34) is surely the best known example, but there are clearer cases:³⁴

ὅστέα μὲν καὶ κωφὸν ἔχει τάφος οὐνομα Σαπφούς·
αἱ δὲ σοφαὶ κείνης ῥήσιες ἀθάνατοι.

(Pinytus AP 7.16 = GPh 1)

The grave holds the bones and the mute name of Sappho;
but her poetic speech is immortal.

³⁰ Certainly neither AP 7.129 nor AP 7.61 acknowledges the importance of *logos* to Plato's formulation of life continuing after the end of the body. Ignatius AP 15.30, a Christian epigram from the ninth century CE, connects *logos* to surviving *arete* but does not equate it to the survival of the person himself.

³¹ In addition to CEG 611, see also CEG 549 and 551.

³² At Pl. *Phd.* 89b–c, Socrates indicates that the process of mourning for him need not be initiated if his *logos* remains alive. Given Socrates' nature, it is no surprise that his *logos* is a dialectic argument, but the persistent *logos* of most people would certainly be the stories told about their lives, i.e. memories of them. For poets, of course, it would be their written work.

³³ For epigrams on authors and their work, see Demoen in this volume.

³⁴ Poetry is closely connected to fame in most of these poems; cf. Leon. AP 7.715 = HE 93, anon. AP 7.84, and Asclep. AP 7.500 = HE 31.

Of course, as we saw earlier, in some of the ‘death by fish’ epigrams, separation of the body into parts is itself sufficient to indicate death, even without mentioning a soul or something else less material that the body now lacks. This idea also has its roots in inscribed epigram. The practice of cremation involved a separation: the body consisted of flesh and bone, of which the former was consumed by the pyre and the latter was buried:

σάρκας μὲν πῦρ | ὄμματ’ ἀφείλετο τῇ | <δ>ε Ὀνησῶς,
 ὅστέα δ’ ἀν|θεμόες χῶρος ὅδ’ ἀνφ<ις ἔχ>ει.
 (CEG 98, Athens, fifth century BCE)

Fire deprived our eyes of Oneso’s flesh here,
 but this flowery spot embraces her bones.

It is clear from this inscribed epigram that poems like Antipater *AP* 7.288 borrow from the cremation tradition to formulate their reply to Leonidas of Tarentum *AP* 7.506.³⁵

Philip of Thessalonica advanced this trend even further, creating new ways to divide the body, but also denying the hope to which the trend had insistently appealed, that at least some part of the self continued to exist. In two poems he divides the body into unusual assortments of pieces but offers no hope for the future. In *AP* 7.362 = *GPh* 78 an orator’s head goes into the earth, his body to Hades, and his soul to Olympus, ‘but neither speech nor a god can make him immortal’ (v. 6).³⁶ The second poem demonstrates even greater futility:

ἡόνιον τόδε σῶμα βροτοῦ παντλήμονος ἄθρει
 σπαρτόν, ἀλιρραγέων ἐκχύμενον σκοπέλων·
 τῇ μὲν ἐρημοκόμης κείται καὶ χῆρος ὀδόντων
 κόρση, τῇ δὲ χερῶν πενταφυεῖς ὄνυχες
 πλευρά τε σαρκολιπῇ, ταρσοὶ δ’ ἐτέρωθεν ἄμοιροι
 νεύρων καὶ κώλων ἔκλυτος ἀρμονίη.
 οὗτος ὁ πουλυμερὴς εἰς ἦν ποτε. φεῦ μακαριστοί,
 ὅσσοι ἀπ’ ὠδίνων οὐκ ἴδον ἠέλιον.

5

(Phil. *AP* 7.383 = *GPh* 32)

Look at this body of an utterly wretched man scattered on the beach,
 the jetsam of the surf-beaten headland.
 Here lies his head, hairless, deprived of teeth,
 there are the five fingers of his hands,
 and his ribs, peeled of their flesh, his feet, both with no tendons,
 and the demolished frame of his limbs.
 This congeries was once a single man. O! Most blessed
 are all who do not look on the sun after their birth pangs!

³⁵ See p. 200 in this chapter.

³⁶ The attribution of the poem is generally doubted (see Gow and Page 1968, 2: 370), and the grounds in favour of attribution to Philip are admittedly slender, though it is worth noting that the two poems clearly share the theme in question here.

The body is broken and scattered. Here not only is immortality not possible (it seems a mockery to mention it; there is not even a soul to which to attach it), but even mortality is pointless: it is better never to see the light of the sun.

3. EXAMPLES OF MORE COMPLEX DIVISIONS

Let us review the material up to this point. We have followed two major threads that lead forward from inscribed epigram. The first was the separation of the dead from the living, which took on greater prominence in the context of shipwreck (or water and land generally), leading to increasingly complex attempts to bridge the boundary; and one of these attempts involved dividing the body. The second thread was that of division within the deceased himself: first, division of the soul from the body (which led, in turn, to a parallel treatment of memory and the body as divided from each other); next, divisions of the body itself.

We can now move on to a few epigrams that interact with this tradition of division and separation and attempt to bridge gaps in unusual ways. First, a poem by Philip of Thessalonica:

*Ἐβρου Θρηϊκίου κρυμῶ πεπεδημένον ὕδωρ
νήπιος ἐμβαίνων οὐκ ἔφυγεν θάνατον·
ἐς ποταμὸν δ' ἤδη λαγαρούμενον ἵχνος ὀλισθῶν
κρυμῶ τοὺς ἀπαλοὺς αὐχένας ἀμφεκάρη.
καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐξεσύρη λοιπὸν δέμας, ἣ δὲ μένουσα
ὄψις ἀναγκαίην εἶχε τάφου πρόφασιν.
δύσμορος, ἧς ὠδῖνα διείλατο πῦρ τε καὶ ὕδωρ·
ἀμφοτέρων δὲ δοκῶν οὐδενός ἐστιν ὅλως.* 5
(Phil. AP 9.56 = GPh 37)

A boy, as he walked on the water of the Thracian Hebrus,
encased in ice, did not escape death.
The river was already thawing, and his foot slipped in;
the ice sliced through his tender neck.
The rest of his body was carried away, and the head,
which remained, required burial.
Unfortunate is the woman whose child was split between fire and water;
though he seems to belong to both, he belongs wholly to neither.

In its basic pattern, this is an epigram modelled after Leonidas of Tarentum AP 7.506: the boy's body is divided between land and water. But the poem innovates by dispensing with both the ship and the large fish required to make Leonidas' poem work. Here the surface of the water itself functions as the 'ship', since it supports the boy's weight over the water; it then turns and

functions as the fish, severing the boy's head with its ice. Since the water in question is a river rather than a lake or the sea, it also has the ability, in effect, to 'swallow' the remainder of the boy, as it is carried off by the rushing current under the surface. This poem seems to demonstrate an almost comically precise setup but, as we can see, its end goal is to simplify: the division between life and death, the division between water and land (or at least quasi-land, in the sense that the surface is frozen), the division between hot and cold, and the division within the body, all occur naturally and without any interfering agent, always at the same point: the surface of the water.

The last verse of Philip's poem invokes the boy's mother. Her grief creates an opportunity for further division, but Philip did not exploit it.³⁷ This can be seen in this somewhat simpler epigram:

παίδων ὃν μὲν ἔκαιεν Ἀρίστιον, ὃν δ' ἐσάκουσε
ναυηγόν· δισσὸν δ' ἄλγος ἔτηξε μίαν.
αἰᾶ, μητέρα Μοῖρα διείλετο, τὴν ἴσα τέκνα
καὶ πυρὶ καὶ πικρῷ νειμαμένην ὕδατι.

(Honest. AP 9.292 = GPh 7)

Aristion was lighting the pyre of one of her children, when she heard
that the other was shipwrecked; the double grief dissolved the one woman.
O! Fate split the mother who apportioned her children
equally to fire and bitter water.

Here the two children die different deaths, one on land and one at sea. The mother's grief for these deaths then divides her as well.

Agathias Scholasticus gives us a particularly complex play on the theme of division in death:

οὐκέτι που, τλήμων σκοπέλων μετανάστρια πέρδιξ,
πλεκτὸς λεπταλέαις οἶκος ἔχει σε λύγοις,
οὐδ' ὑπὸ μαρμαρυγῇ θαλερώπιδος Ἑριγενείης
ἄκρα παραιθύσσεις θαλπομένων πτερύγων.
σὴν κεφαλὴν αἴλουρος ἀπέθρισε· τᾶλλα δὲ πάντα
ἦρπασα, καὶ φθονερὴν οὐκ ἐκόρεσσε γένυν.
νῦν δέ σε μὴ κούφη κρύπτει κόνις, ἀλλὰ βαρεῖα,
μὴ τὸ τεὸν κείνη λείψανον ἐξέρυση.

(Agath. AP 7.204)

Poor partridge, fugitive from the cliffs! No longer, I suppose,
does your woven home hold you in its slender withes,
nor do you flutter your wing tips under the gleam of warm-eyed Dawn
the early riser to keep them warm.
A cat cut off your head, but I snatched away all the rest;

³⁷ The grief of parents is a common topic from early inscribed epigram; see, for instance, CEG 50, 84, 117, 513, 518, 529, 543, 557, 585, 587, 591, 593, 604, 686, 689, and 704.

it did not glut its greedy jaws.
 Now may the dust not hide you lightly, but heavily,
 lest she drag off what is left of you.

While this poem, too, is modelled on the theme of death by fish bite, it skilfully moves around the elements, beginning with water. Here there is no water at all, and it is the boundary between earth and sky that matters: we are dealing with a partridge, not a fish. The partridge, however, is pictured in much the same way as a caught fish would be: it is out of its element, an exile from its lofty rocky homeland, captured in a latticework cage woven (*πλεκτός*) like a fishing net. But this bird is no shark, as the fish was in Leonidas of Tarentum (*AP* 7.506); the partridge is the vulnerable one, almost a mirror image of the humans who find themselves the victims of a carnivorous fish. The cat is a predator. When the cat bites, it is the bird's head that it gets. This is a reversal of the tradition: the head or upper body was always the preserved element,³⁸ while the lower body was taken. But in fact it is not entirely clear who is the predator here: after all, it is the narrator who uses the verb *ῥηρπασα* (v. 6) for himself, and it is a verb typically used of the forces of death. What is more, surely it is the splitting of the body, regardless of who pulled on it from what direction, that killed the bird. The last couplet contains a further redirection. In a reversal of the expected blessing, the narrator wishes for the dust to lie heavy on the partridge's body. But this is no curse; rather he wishes it in the hope that the rest of the body may not be dragged away by the cat. This, however, puts the cat in a position analogous with that of the too close sea, which threatens to exhume and swallow the man it already killed.³⁹

4. CONCLUSIONS

At the core of the phenomena explored in this chapter are sepulchral epigrams on the theme of a body lost at sea. (These are often called 'shipwreck epigrams', although, as we have seen, not all corpses adrift or washed ashore met their fate as a result of shipwreck.) By examining this theme through the lens of an older, simpler, and more common motif—that of separation—we have seen the full connection between these epigrams and the ideas that animate the genre of sepulchral epigram as a whole. Separation lay behind the practice of burial from the very beginning; the earliest inscribed epigrams speak of the separation of the dead from the living, or of the separation of body

³⁸ See Leon. *AP* 7.506 = *HE* 65, Phil. *AP* 7.362 = *GPh* 78, and *AP* 9.56 = *GPh* 37.

³⁹ See e.g. Diocl. of Carystus *AP* 7.393 = *GPh* 1.

from the soul. Other phenomena relevant to death and memorialization—one's name, fame, memory, and the like—were spoken of in the same terms.

In this context, we can see many of the variations within sepulchral epigram as manifestations of the epigrammatists' efforts to reinforce these separations or to bridge them. Distance, the barrier of the sea, or the fracturing or consumption of the body might reinforce them; return of the body to land might bridge them; displacing or confusing the interactions between earth and water, or between men and fish, might obscure them. In the end, even quite different epigrams, featuring a knotted hare and octopus, a pet cat and a pet partridge, or a tragic accident on the ice, can be seen as resulting from variations on this same scheme.

Yet bridging a separation is by no means equivalent to erasing it. Plato's simpler narrative of survival did not catch on in epigram. Attempts at reconciling opposites not only remind the reader of previous oppositions but also introduce new ones, as when the burial of a body returned to land severed a deceased man from his name or fragmented the parts of the body itself.

The lines traced here are, in their way, emblematic of trends in Hellenistic poetry as a whole. We do not see wholesale invention, but rather a rearrangement of elements long in use. And these innovations cannot simply be classed as play. The final epigram analysed here, for instance, with its artful displacement of sea, land, and sky, and of predator and prey, may cause pet owners to reflect upon their own role in the captivity and death of beloved animals, especially when their final saving act, a prayer for the grave to lie heavily upon the deceased, so strongly implies a curse.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ The usual motif was, of course, that the dust, grave marker, etc. should 'rest lightly', as in Agath. AP 7.583, Call. AP 7.460 = HE 47, Crin. AP 7.628 = GPh 17, Diod. AP 7.632 = GPh 7, Mel. AP 7.461 = HE 124, Phil. AP 7.554 = GPh 27, Posidipp. 61 and 93 A–B, and Theoc. AP 7.658 = HE 7 (to name just a few). See also other ironic variations on the 'rest lightly' theme in Ammian. AP 11.226 and Crin. AP 7.401 = GPh 41.

Part 4

Gods, Religion, and Cult

Epigrammatic Variations/Debate on the Theme of Cybele's Music

Marco Fantuzzi

1. GALLI AND THE EPIGRAM

(I) Cybele's priests are perhaps the most popular priests in the *Greek Anthology*. More than a dozen epigrams survive from Meleager's and Philip's *Garlands* that touch upon several aspects of Cybele's cult through accounts of her priests' and priestesses' dedications or funerary inscriptions. The viewpoint presented in most of the epigrams on these priests and priestesses—in many cases, but not always, the emasculated priests known as γάλλοι/*galli*—differs significantly from their treatment in Catullus 63. Chronologically, Catullus' poem comes before a series of negative or indignant descriptions of the emasculated *galli* in imperial Rome and after several critical remarks in Greek and Latin authors on the lack of control induced by Cybele's music. However, the heat of Catullus' indignation at Attis' emasculation and irrational submission to the goddess appears to be without an exact parallel in Greek culture. In fact most of the epigrams that focus on the motif of the lion's encounter with the *gallus* in the cave appear rather to highlight the miraculous powers of Cybele's music. They thus demonstrate that a wider and multifaceted cultural discussion existed in the background to Catullus' indignant attitude towards the castration of the *galli*. Catullus, I shall argue, seems to build his narrative about the *gallus* and the terrifying lion sent by the goddess on a precise reversal of the epigrammatic motif of the *gallus* who terrifies the lion with his music. The poet may have seen these epigrams as examples of a defensive and eulogistic approach to Cybele's cult and her emasculated priests, which opposed his own indignant rebuttal.

The epigrams dealing with Cybele's cult, music, and priests are not all variations on the same theme, but they all show the same concern for a cultural evaluation of the frenzy displayed by both Cybele's music and the

priests who ministered her rites, although these assessments vary at different chronotopic stages. The poets' focus shifts; we move from Rhianus' perplexity in the face of the enthusiastic, uncontrollable effects of Cybele's music to the celebration of its superior power in the third- and second-century BCE variants of the story of the *gallus* and the lion,¹ then back again to emphasis on its negative, orgiastic character in Thyillus—an epigrammatist who, tellingly, appears to have been a younger contemporary of Catullus and to have lived in Rome. All these epigrams, although dealing with different motifs related to the goddess, seem to participate in a debate that pivoted on two strongly interconnected questions. How acceptable was Cybele's ecstatic music, and how acceptable were the priests who played it?

The relevance of and interconnection between these two questions is obvious; and it is also easily understandable that Cybele's religion was destined to provoke fresh questions and discussions during the Hellenistic period. As is well known, Cybele and Attis were relatively new acquisitions in the Greek pantheon: the former can be dated to the sixth century BCE, but the latter only to the last decades of the fourth. In particular, the term *gallus*, the most common title for Cybele's male priests from the third century BCE onwards, was probably a Hellenistic word. It is first attested in some of the epigrams analysed in the forthcoming paragraphs—namely by Rhianus (*AP* 6.173) and 'Simonides' (*AP* 6.217)—and in a fragment that is sometimes ascribed to Callimachus (fr. 761 Pf.).² The term probably derived from the ethnic *Γαλάται* ('Galatians'), a Celtic people who settled in Phrygia—in the area of Pessinus and the river Gallus—at the beginning of the third century BCE.³

The diffusion of these male priests may have had a strong impact on Athenian society (and probably on other *poleis* as well) at the end of the sixth, or more probably the fifth century BCE.⁴ We only possess information from late sources⁵ that may, however, preserve an older tradition with a base in historical actuality: according to the sources, the Athenians killed a Phrygian *μητράγυρτης* who had started to initiate Attic women into the mysteries of the goddess. A plague or a crop failure followed and an oracle bid the Athenians to appease the Phrygian whom they had killed. They therefore transformed a part of the *bouleuterion* ('council house') into a

¹ The story probably has old Indo-European roots, as suggested by West (1969), 117–18 (see now also Bonsignore 2013, 69–70).

² See Harder (2005), 67.

³ See Lane (1996). Cybele's male priests are attested in Greek literature before *galloi* became their standard title. See the story about the *ἀγεραικύβηλις* ('Cybele's mendicant priest') in Cratin. fr. 66 PCG, and also the one about the *μητράγυρτης* ('Cybele's begging priest') killed by the Athenians at the end of the sixth century BCE (nn. 6 and 40 in this chapter). But these priests are mentioned in classical literature extremely rarely.

⁴ On the chronology, see Cerri (1983), 172–6.

⁵ The earliest source is Julian. *Or.* 5.159a. The other sources are Phot. *Lex.* β 61 and μ 423 Theodorides; Σ Aeschin. 3.187; Σ Ar. *Pl.* 431; *Suda* β 99.

sanctuary of Cybele, where the Phrygian priest was buried. This anecdote, unless it is an invention by late sources, appears to have been a ‘resistance myth’, created at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century BCE in order to convey opposition to the increasing fortune of Cybele’s cult in Athens; at the end of the fifth century BCE a new statue of Cybele, with lions and a drum, was erected by Pheidias or by his pupil Agoracritus in the Athenian Metroon.⁶ As such, it would not be dissimilar from the anecdotes about the solemn, albeit controversial establishment of Magna Mater’s cult in Rome.⁷ It is in the double framework of this opposition to and appreciation of Cybele’s ecstatic cult and strange male priests, begging and castrated,⁸ that we should read the various standpoints about Cybele’s music in Hellenistic epigram.

‘The Greeks seem to have discovered ecstatic cults connected with flute music in northern Asia Minor among the Phrygians; accordingly, the possession mentioned most frequently is the possession by the Mother of the Gods.’⁹ Cybele’s music has very often been highlighted as the exciting background that promoted her ecstatic rites (called ὄργια or τελεταί, like the ones of Dionysus and Demeter),¹⁰ and the Athenian Stranger in the *Laws* discusses the occasional utility, but also the fundamental unsuitability of the ecstatic music of the Corybantic and Bacchic rites in Magnesia (Plato’s second best hypothetical city, after the *Republic*’s ideal Callipolis).¹¹ To be more specific, the goddesses’ typical instruments—the τύμπανα (‘drums’), ῥόμβοι (‘bullroarers’), and κύμβαλα (‘cymbals’)—were listed by Philodemus in his treatise *De musica*¹² as the ones most capable of producing an ecstatic state, ‘above all in women or

⁶ Σ Aeschin. 3.187 (see n. 5 in this chapter) quotes a detail of this story as reported in a work entitled *Philippics*, which probably belongs to the anti-Macedonian literature of the second half of the fourth century BCE. This may be a clue to an early origin for the narrative of the μητράργυρης killed in Athens. Cf. Cerri (1983); Versnel (1990), 106; Roller (1999), 163. However, for a different view, see Parker (1996), 189–90.

⁷ Cf. D.S. 36.13; Plu. *Mor.* 17.5; Wiseman (1974), 118; Versnel (1990), 105 n. 35.

⁸ Roller (1999), 166: ‘The function of the myth is not to condemn the deity’s priest but to praise the deity, and the concept of resistance in the myth forms a foil to the deity’s power, demonstrating the deity’s ability to overcome all challenges to its authority.’

⁹ Burkert (1985), 110; cf. Sfameni Gasparro (1985), 15–16. On the numerous ancient testimonies on intoxicating music, in particular that of the αἰολοί, as conducive to ecstasy, see Linforth (1946).

¹⁰ See Sfameni Gasparro (1985), 9–25.

¹¹ On Plato and ecstatic music, see Linforth (1946), who stresses Plato’s preoccupation with the power of ecstatic music to influence the soul (see in particular Pl. *Lg.* 7.790d2–e4). Folch (2015), 218 correctly observes that nowhere in the *Laws* are ecstatic performances incorporated into Magnesia’s musical repertoire: ‘Ecstatic and Bacchic dances thus represent the alter ego to Magnesia’s version of a regulated sympotic and festival culture, inducing psychic states (purification and calming of fear) that are amenable to the project of the *Laws*, but at the same time stimulating and attributing to divine inspiration behaviors (unrestrained drunkenness and madness) that it opposes.’

¹² Kemke (1884), 49.

[womanish men]' (*γυναικάς ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ καὶ γυναι[κώδεις ἄνδρας*], where the last phrase, if the supplement is correct, may point to the *galli*).¹³ In fact the most consistent detail in the Greek iconography of Cybele, already featuring in the statue of her erected by Pheidias or Agoracritus, is the drum, which had a more marginal role for the original Anatolian goddess.¹⁴ Almost all early literary testimonies on Cybele focus on her connection with the music produced by her typical instruments and often emphasize their orgiastic effects.¹⁵ The tragedian Diogenes the Athenian describes with didactic precision the instruments that were typically used by Cybele's worshippers, dwelling on both the way in which they were played and their benevolent effect (*TrGF* 45F1.1–4): 'Indeed, I hear the headband-wearing women devoted to Asian Cybele, the children of the wealthy Phrygians, producing an uproar with drums, bullroarers, and the booming of bronze cymbals they hold in both hands... a wise goddess, singer of hymns and also a healer'¹⁶ (*τυπάνοισι καὶ ῥόμβοισι καὶ χαλκοκτύπων | βόμβοις βρεμούσας ἀντίχερσι κυμβάλων <...> σοφὴν θεῶν ὑμνωδὸν ἰατρόν θ' ἄμα*).¹⁷ This passage is especially revealing, as the sounds of Cybele's music are here clearly characterized as clamorous (*βόμβοις*), but the goddess herself, who enjoys them, is qualified as a 'wise goddess' and a 'healer', and this seems to point to the therapeutic and salvific effects of her music.¹⁸ Similar instruments—the *αὐλοί*, the *κρόταλα* ('castanets'), and the *τύμπανα* ('drums')—occur in an *adespoton* fragment from a melic or more probably tragic song that describes the rites of *θεὸς ἡ μεγάλη* (*TrGF adesp.* 629). This fragment is datable to the fourth or early third century BCE, but it is too fragmentary to permit us to understand the nature of the poet's evaluation of Cybele's music.

In Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes, Cybele and her orgiastic music have already become a culturally established 'binomium', which triggered the

¹³ See Summers (1996), 347–8.

¹⁴ See Roller (1999), 148–50. For the later iconography, see Vendries (2001).

¹⁵ See Pachis (1996), 209–13. The brief late archaic (or later) 'Homeric' hymn to the Mother of the Gods presents the goddess as appreciating especially castanets (*κρόταλα*), drums (*τύμπανα*), and the roar of *αὐλοί* (*βρόμος αὐλῶν*). In a short list of the various kinds of festive music played in the halls of the Ouranian gods, Pindar mentions drums and castanets in connection with Cybele (*Dith.* 2, F 70b 8–11). At *Hel.* 1301–52, Euripides' description of the grief of the Mother of the Gods (identified with Demeter) for her daughter opens and concludes with hints at her usual instruments: roaring cymbals (*κρόταλα βρόμια*, v. 1308), drums formed from stretched hide (*τύμπανα... βυρσοτενῆ*, v. 1347), and a deep sounding pipe (*βαρύβρομον αὐλόν*, vv. 1351–2); see Sfameni Gasparro (1978).

¹⁶ Translation from Olson (2011), 219, slightly modified. 'Singer of hymns' is the common interpretation of *ὑμνωδός*. I could find no evidence for a passive sense of *ὑμνωδός* ('who is celebrated in songs') favoured by Olson (2011), 219.

¹⁷ As Marcus Folch points out to me in correspondence, the sonorous alliterative onomatopoeics of the first verse (full of *typ-*, *bom-*, and *brem-* sounds) performs at the phonetic level the clamorous rumbling and noise characteristic of Cybele's music.

¹⁸ Cybele's soteriological power as a healer is evoked in several inscriptions of the imperial age; see Sfameni Gasparro (1985), 86–7. Rhea is already a healing goddess in Pindar (see *Pi.* 3.77–8).

two opposite viewpoints under which her cult, as embedded in literature, will be considered. Callimachus' third iambus presents the tossing of one's hair as a feature of Cybele's cult, coupled with a 'soft' implicit disparagement of the lack of control that it demonstrates. The speaker, disillusioned by his unfaithful lover, rethinks his life. In particular, he wishes that, instead of having devoted himself to the Muses, he had spent his time in singing and dancing orgiastically for 'Cybebe' (read Cybele) or Adonis: 'I would have been better off tossing my hair for Cybebe to the Phrygian *aulos*' (μοι τοῦτ' ἂν ᾗν δνῆϊς[το]ν | .]ν[.] | .]Κ[υβή]βῃ τὴν κόμην ἀναρρίπτειν | Φρύγ[α] πρ[ὸς] αὐλόν, fr. 193.34–6 Pf.). Dancing for Cybele and becoming an emasculated *gallus*¹⁹—thus displacing the female Muses from their traditional activity as dancers and inspirers of dancing²⁰—constitutes a degradation in which no self-respecting poet or male would indulge. By contrast, the erroneous second landing at the kingdom of Cyzicus and the consequent bloody fight between the Argonauts and Doliones in Book 1 of Apollonius of Rhodes conclude with the description of the Argonauts' dance in arms, βηταρμόν ἐνόπλιον (A.R. *Argon.* 1.1135), which was intended to expiate the slaughter of the friendly Doliones and their king by imitating and 'loosing in the air' the cries of grief that the Doliones were still sending up in lament for their king (1.1134–8). The noisy, metallic sounds of this dance in arms are presented as the *aition* of the booming sounds characterizing the Phrygian rites for Rhea: 'since then, the Phrygians have always propitiated Rhea with the bullroarer and the tambourine' (1.1138–9). The goddess showed a special appreciation for this kind of music so that 'the trees shed fruit in abundance, and at their feet the earth spontaneously sprouted flowers from the tender grass; wild animals left their dens and lairs and approached wagging their tails [θῆρες δ' εἰλυούς τε κατὰ ξυλόχους τε λιπόντες | οὐρῇσιν σαίνοντες ἐπήλυθον]. And she also performed yet another miracle [τέρας], for water had never before flowed on (the mountain) Dindymum, but then, just like that, it gushed forth for them without cease from the arid peak' (1.1140–8).²¹ As we shall see, this connection between Cybele's music and the 'miracles' (in particular the miracle of taming wild animals) that the goddess performs for those who play it, as she is apparently moved by it, is not attested before Hellenistic epigram, but Apollonius' passage provides an extremely close parallel for the tale of the *gallus* and the lion, the most frequently encountered narrative among the defensive and eulogistic epigrams on Cybele's music.

Most epigrams on Cybele feature dedications made by *galli*, and in almost all of them the dedication is related to the restraining of the lion through music typical of Cybele's rites (Diosc. *AP* 6.220 = *HE* 16, Alc. Mess. *AP* 6.218 = *HE* 21, Antip. Sid. *AP* 6.219 = *HE* 64, 'Simon.' *AP* 6.217 = *HE* 2, and Antist. *AP* 6.237 = *GPh* 1). In a few cases the dedication is made by a *gallus* but without being connected

¹⁹ See Acosta-Hughes (2002), 225.

²⁰ See Kerkhecker (1999), 80.

²¹ Translation from Race (2009), 95, with changes.

to the lion episode (Phld. *AP* 7.222 = *GPh* 26, Eryc. *AP* 6.234 = *GPh* 10, Phil. *AP* 6.94 = *GPh* 14), or the epigram is not linked to a dedication at all (Diosc. *AP* 9.340 = *HE* 35 and *AP* 11.195 = *HE* 36). Other epigrams present dedications made by a female priest and mention the ritual hair tossing (Leon. *AP* 6.281 = *HE* 44, Rhian. *AP* 6.173 = *HE* 7, Thyill. *AP* 7.223 = *FGE* 2, and the anon. *AP* 6.51 = *HE* 42).

Leonidas of Tarentum *AP* 6.281 is probably the oldest extant epigram related to Cybele:

Δίνδυμα καὶ Φρυγίης πυρικαέος ἀμφιπολεῦσα
 πρῶνας τὴν μικρὴν, Μῆτερ, Ἀριστοδίκην,
 κούρην Σείληνης, παμπότνια, κεῖς ὑμέναιον
 κεῖς γάμον ἀβρύναις, πείρατα κουροσύνας·
 ἀνθ' ὧν σοι κατὰ πολλὰ προνήια καὶ παρὰ βωμῶ
 παρθενικὴν ἑτίναξ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα κόμην.

5

(Leon. *AP* 6.281 = *HE* 44)

Great Mother, you who watch over Dindyma and the hills of burnt Phrygia,
 O sovereign lady, beautify little Aristodice,
 Seilene's daughter, to the point of maturity ripe for marriage
 and the hymn of Hymenaeus, the due end of girlhood.
 For this, dancing at many a festival held in your courts and before your
 altar, she tossed this way and that her virgin hair.²²

Aristodice asks the goddess to reward her pious service with a successful marriage (or, alternatively, her mother Seilene asks for this on her behalf). The epigram focuses on hair tossing as the key aspect of the ecstasy of Cybele's rites. There is no explicit critical evaluation in the reference to the tossing of the girl's hair, though the violent movement conveyed by *ἐτίναξ'* (v. 6), reinforced by *ἐνθα καὶ ἔνθα*, and the implicit opposition between agitated convulsion and the dignified sedateness expected from a 'virgin' make it obvious why the tossing of the hair, so different from conventional behaviour, constitutes a service to the goddess, a proof of devotion that Cybele should gratefully reciprocate.

The kinetic and acoustic convulsion caused by Cybele's music dominates more clearly Rhianus' poem:

Ἀχρυλὶς, ἡ Φρυγίη θαλαμηπόλος, ἡ περὶ πεύκας
 πολλάκι τοὺς ἱεροὺς χευαμένη πλοκάμους,
 γαλλαίῳ Κυβέλης ὀλολύγματι πολλάκι δοῦσα
 τὸν βαρὺν εἰς ἀκοὰς ἦχον ἀπὸ στομάτων,
 τάσδε θεῇ χαίτας περὶ δικλίδι θήκεν ὀρείῃ,
 θερμὸν ἐπεὶ λύσσης ὧδ' ἀνέπασσε πόδα.

5

(Rhian. *AP* 6.173 = *HE* 7)

²² The translations of the epigrams are from Paton (occasionally slightly altered). The Greek texts are from *HE*, *GPh*, and *FGE* (occasionally with modifications).

Achrylis, Rhea's Phrygian lady-in-waiting, who
 often under the pines loosed her consecrated hair,
 who often uttered from her lips the sharp cry
 that Cybele's *galloi* use, painful to hear,
 dedicated her hair at the door of the mountain goddess,
 where she rested her burning feet from the mad race.

Possibly at the end of her service, described in verses 3–4 as the singing of the booming music of the *galli*, the priestess dedicates her hair, whose tossing had accompanied her songs. The phrase *χευαμένη πλοκάμους* (v. 2) closely parallels Euripides' *πλόκαμος . . . ταναός . . . γένυν παρ' αὐτὴν κεχυμένος* ('braided hair . . . scattered over your cheeks') at *Bacchae* 455–6, which concerns worshippers affected by Dionysiac frenzy. It is difficult to ascertain whether the allusion was meant to highlight the similarity of atmosphere between the Metroac and Dionysiac rites or whether it constituted just the reuse of an idiomatic expression for religious and profane frenzy. The term *ὀλολύγματι* (v. 3) has dirge-like undertones, especially after its frequent use in Attic classical tragedy, and *βαρύν* (v. 4), meaning 'deep-toned' but also 'disturbingly unpleasant', reinforces the connotations of *ὀλολυγμός*. The epigram is one of the very few where the unseemly, deep, or lugubrious songs and sounds of Cybele's music are ascribed to a female priestess (though see Thyillus *AP* 7.223, discussed later on in this chapter). It is perhaps important that the poem presents the sounds uttered by Achrylis as a sort of participation in the songs and sounds of the *galli*. Her voice is an *ῆχος* belonging to the music of the *galli* (*γαλλαίῳ . . . ὀλολύγματι . . . δοῦσα . . . τὸν βαρὺν ῆχον*); it is not autonomous.²³ This presentation of the priestess' voice as quasi-*gallus* may in effect reveal a phase of transition towards the monopoly over Cybele's music that the *galli* seem to have enjoyed almost ubiquitously in later epigrams.

Two centuries after Rhianus, the dedication of hair or musical instruments by a *gallus* who retires from ritual service appears to be a common motif in epigrams: it features in Erycius *AP* 6.234 = *GPh* 10, a poem that plausibly dates from the third quarter of the first century BCE,²⁴ in Philip *AP* 6.94 = *GPh* 14, in the anonymous *AP* 6.51 = *HE* 42, and in Thyillus *AP* 7.223 = *FGE* 2, which is similar in content but funerary, not dedicatory. In all these texts, a negative evaluation of the lack of self-control that characterized the participants in Cybele's rites, and in particular their music, seems to have become part and parcel of the discourse on Cybele's cult and its practitioners. Erycius in *AP* 6.234

²³ Pachis (1996), 201–2 suggests that Rhianus adopts as his character a female priestess instead of a *gallus* because women are more common protagonists of ecstatic rites in Greek culture. Thus Rhianus purposefully de-emphasizes the castration of Cybele's priests, which represents the most foreign and exotic trace of the oriental origins of her cult. In Pachis' opinion, the offering of cut hair by the priestess is also a controlled and 'civilized' substitute for the castration and offering of the testicles to the goddess by the *galli*.

²⁴ See Gow and Page (1968), 2: 279.

highlights that his *gallus* has been ‘recently gelded’ (or that he was ‘gelded in his youth’, v. 1);²⁵ he underlines his long hair (probably hinting at his hair tossing), the high volume of his shrieking, and its mournful undertones (μάκρ’ ὀλολυζόμενος, v. 2; cf. Rhianus AP 6.173); and he also adds (and this is not in Rhianus) a general definition of his past ritual service as λύσσα (‘frenzy’, v. 6). A reference to the *gallus*’ ὀλολυγμός (v. 4) and the definition of his dancing as ‘frenzied’ (λυσσητήρη... πόδα, v. 7) can also be found in Philip AP 6.94. But it is in the anonymous AP 6.51 that the identification of the ecstasy of the cult of Rhea/Cybele and of her musical instruments with ‘madness’ is most explicit. Rhea’s instruments, the ‘shrill toned [ὀξύφθογγα] cymbals’ and the ‘deep-voiced *auloi*’ (βαρυφθόγων... αὐλῶν, vv. 5–6), are explicitly described as the ‘stimulants of the madness’ (οἰστροήματα λύσσης, v. 3) that the *gallus* Alexis finally dedicates to the goddess together ‘with the hair which he used to toss in the past’ (v. 8), having ceased the ‘fury of the clashing bronze’ (v. 4), in the quietness of old age that replaces the ‘wildness’ and ‘madness’ of his youth (vv. 9–10). The reference to the ‘knives reddened with blood’ (αἷματι φοιnichθέντα φάσγανα, vv. 7–8) involves a sinister hint at the self-mutilation of the former male Alexis, whose blood stained this kind of knife when he became θῆλυς (‘female’, v. 3).

Probably very close in time to Erycius, Philip AP 6.94, the anonymous AP 6.51, and Thyillus AP 7.223,²⁶ which is a funerary epigram about a dancer (or priestess-dancer) of Cybele called Aristion, broaden still further the list of grievances concerning the lack of control into which Cybele’s worshippers and ministers were driven. The death of Thyillus’ Aristion is presented as the result of (in fact almost as a liberation from, given the use of ἀναπαύεται in v. 5)²⁷ a series of convulsive forms of lack of control and excessive behaviour stigmatized as κῶμοι καὶ μανίαι (v. 7): dishevelment of the hair (v. 2), total abandonment of oneself to the music of the αὐλοί (λωτῶ... φορουμένη, v. 3), and drinking and erotic intemperance that lasted all night long (vv. 3–4 and 5–6). Nothing in this text or in any other testimony explicitly ascribes all these various forms of lack of restraint to Cybele’s cult (Aristion may have been an *untypical* priestess and an individual too intemperate with sex and drinks). However, Aristion’s forms of *ritual* lack of control—the tossing of the hair and the abandonment to the music of the αὐλοί—open the list of her faults and thus seem to express (as the μανίαι do) her intemperance, together with drinking and erotic deregulation, although wine and sex, presented in crescendo, form the peak of her uncontrollable conduct.²⁸

²⁵ Ibid., 2: 285. In contrast to anon. AP 6.51.9–10, in Eryc. AP 6.234 there is no hint that the *gallus* is old.

²⁶ Thyillus lived in the first century BCE. See Wiseman (1974), 132–3 and 145–6.

²⁷ For similar verbs and ideas, cf. Eryc. AP 6.234 and anon. AP 6.51.

²⁸ For the idea of sexual intemperance frequently connected to the παννυχίδες (‘all-night festivals’), see most recently Kanellou (2012), 33–4.

The hyperbole in Aristion's paroxysmal upheaval might be in principle the unintentional outcome of the rhetoric of the funerary epigram that intends to highlight the absolute quietness of death. However, the same opposition between ritual upheaval and the positive rhetoric of calmness or silenced noisy music also characterizes the 'retirement' of the *gallus* in Erycius AP 6.234 and in Philip AP 6.94 and the quietness after the storm in the anonymous epigram AP 6.51. We are left with the impression that, rather than being determined by the conventional rhetoric of the calmness of death or retirement, these epigrams intentionally adopt this very rhetoric as a helpful structural frame within which to highlight their unexpected core topic: the convulsive noise, upheaval, and lack of control in Cybele's rites. These epigrams thus appear to distance themselves purposefully from, and implicitly criticize, the dishevelled atmosphere of Cybele's rites. Thyillus' epigram and the anonymous piece, in particular, with their relative severity about the frenzy of Aristion and Alexis respectively, constitute the Greek pendants—though much sweetened ones—to the indignant stance of Catullus' *Attis* about the castrated proto-*gallus*. True, their tone is anything but derogatory or indignant, and some sympathy for Aristion and the *galli* of the epigrams of Erycius, Philip, and the anonymous poet of AP 6.51 seems to be allowed, precisely because, after all, they have 'stopped' their frenzy. But the criticism of the frenzy of the music and rituals of Cybele's cult is also clearly evident in all these epigrams.

(II) However, for almost two centuries, that is, between Rhianus and the cluster of the first-century epigrams composed by Erycius, Philip, Thyillus, and probably the anonymous author of AP 6.51, no surviving epigram mentions or qualifies Cybele's rites as frenzied. What is more, during that period Cybele's loud and deep music becomes the exclusive prerogative of the emasculated *galli* and is celebrated—rather than criticized—for its powerful effect in the stereotypical story of the *gallus* and the lion, where this music acquires the power to save.

The author who may have made the pendulum swing in favour of Cybele's music was Dioscorides. The poet probably lived a few decades after Rhianus, or was his younger contemporary; it seems certain that, at least in one passage, Dioscorides imitated Rhianus or vice versa.²⁹ So, soon before or soon after the explicit, albeit soft, criticism of the orgiastic frenzy of Cybele's music in

²⁹ Ὡδ' ἀνέπαυσε πόδα, said for the dead *gallus* in Rhian. AP 6.173.6, is found in Diosc. AP 7.37.6, where it is used for the light foot (δρχρηστῆν... πόδα) of a satyr's statue erected on Sophocles' tomb to commemorate his role in the development of satyr drama. Independently of who preceded whom, the author who followed pointedly compared the uncontrolled dances of the *galli* to the frequently hectic and frenzied dances of the satyr choruses, thus institutionalizing and historicizing the latter.

Rhianus AP 6.173, Dioscorides dedicated to Cybele's music three epigrams that highlight its intrinsically miraculous and soteriological nature, thus expressing an implicit appreciation of it.

Dioscorides AP 9.340 narrates the *heurematistic* myth according to which Hyagnis invented the αὐλοί when the Mother of the Gods first introduced her rites, and also when—as a consequence of the revelation of Cybele's rites, according to the logic of Dioscorides' discourse—her priests were first compelled to loose their lovely locks to its music.

αὐλοὶ τοῦ Φρυγὸς ἔργον Ὑάγνιδος, ἥνικα Μήτηρ
 ἱερὰ τὰν Κυβέλοις πρῶτ' ἀνέδειξε θεῶν
 καὶ πρὸς ἑμὸν φώνημα καλὴν ἀνέλυστο χαίτην
 ἔκφρων Ἰδαίης ἀμφίπολος θαλάμης·
 εἰ δὲ Κελαινίτης ποιμὴν †πάρος οὐ περ αἰέσας
 ἐγνώσθη Φοῖβου κέϊνον ἔδειξεν ἔρις†.

5

(Diosc. AP 9.340 = HE 35)

The *auloi* was the work of Phrygian Hyagnis at the time when the Mother of the Gods first revealed her rites on Cybela, and when the frantic servant of the Idaean chamber first loosed his lovely locks to my notes. But if the shepherd of Celaenae long ago ... (?) was known, his strife with Phoebus demonstrated ... (?)

The last distich is corrupt, and no satisfactory emendation has won large consensus. But it is obvious that the myth of the invention of the αὐλοί by Hyagnis opposes another version, according to which the musical instrument was 'found' by Marsyas after Athena had invented and thrown it away because her appearance was unappealing when she was playing it.³⁰ If the 'Celaenean shepherd' is Marsyas, as is widely accepted,³¹ then ἔρις in the last verse must point to the strife between him and Apollo: Marsyas challenged the god to a musical contest that resulted in Marsyas being defeated and flayed alive. Thus the most probable sense of the last distich is that, in any case, even if Marsyas was the inventor of the αὐλοί, his invention had been marred by the fact that it led to an impious strife with Apollo. The point of the epigram seems, then, to verge on the opposition between the religious consent that backed up or even motivated Hyagnis and the contentious stance of the other possible inventor, Marsyas, towards the divine.

Let us compare Dioscorides AP 9.340 with his AP 11.195, which adopts an elitist position reminiscent of Callimachus' epigrams on theatrical success or lack thereof.³²

³⁰ For this myth and its sources, see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 264–5.

³¹ Ibid., 2: 266.

³² Call. AP 9.565 = HE 57, AP 9.566 = HE 58, and AP 11.362 = HE 59; see Fantuzzi (2007).

γάλλον Ἀρισταγόρης ὤρχήσατο· τοὺς δὲ φιλόπλους

Τημενίδας ὁ καμῶν πολλὰ διήλθον ἐγώ.

χὼ μὲν τιμηθεὶς ἀπεπέμπετο· τὴν δὲ τάλαιναν

Ἵρνηθὼ κροτάλων εἰς ψόφος ἐξέβαλεν.

εἰς πῦρ ἡρώων ἔτε πρήξεις· ἐν γὰρ ἁμούσοις

καὶ κόρυδος κύκνου φθέγγετ' αἰοιδότερον.

(Diosc. AP 11.195 = HE 36)

Aristagoras danced the part of a *gallus*, while I,

with great labour, went through the story of the warlike Temenidae.

He was dismissed with honour, but poor

Hyrrhetho one unceasing storm of rattles sent off the boards.

Into the fire you go, exploits of the heroes! For among the unmusical

even a lark will sing more musically than a swan.

The speaker seems initially to present himself as being concerned with mythological stories, *ἡρώων* . . . *πρήξεις* (v. 5), about which the Callimachus of the *Aetia* prologue (v. 5) would have been rather critical or sceptical. However, the choice of the specific heroes privileged by the speaker—the Temenidae and Hyrrhetho, obscure outside Theban local cults—possibly re-establishes the author as aligned with the Callimachean aesthetics of the *recherché*. In fact the conclusion is that the deeds of the mythological heroes narrated by the speaker of the epigram appear to interest no one any more, whereas the noisy performances of the dances of the *gallus* win the universal favour of large audiences. Despite indignation for his own defeat, the speaker seems to admit with sadness, at the end of the poem, the superior attractiveness of the dancing *gallus*. The wish to devote oneself to the musical activity of a *gallus* had been a paradoxical form of self-disparagement in Callimachus' *Iambus* 3.35–6.³³ Now, in an amusing interplay with his model, the post-Callimachean speaker acknowledges that dancing like a *gallus* is more rewarding than being a poet. The fact that the members of this audience are qualified as *ἁμούσοι* (v. 5) does very little to detract from the acknowledgement of the extremely powerful effect of the music of the *galli*. Besides, the point of the epigram may not be a wholly sympathetic revival of Callimachean aesthetics, but rather the soft caricature of a Callimachean poet's misfortunes due to not being up to date with the tastes of modern audiences.

Dioscorides' clearest picture of the strong bonds between the religiosity of Cybele's followers and her music—noisy *but* sent by the goddess, and thus powerful—finds expression in AP 6.220:

Σάρδις Πεσσινόεντος ἀπὸ Φρυγὸς ἦθελ' ἰκέσθαι,

ἔκφρων μαινομένην δοὺς ἀνέμοισι τρίχα,

ἀγνὸς Ἄττυς, Κυβέλης θαλαμηπόλος· ἄγρια δ' αὐτοῦ

³³ See p. 217 in this chapter.

ἐψύχθη χαλεπῆς πνεύματα θευφορίας
 ἐσπέριον στείχοντος ἀνὰ κνέφας· εἰς δὲ κάταντες 5
 ἄντρον ἔδου νέυσας βαιὸν ἄπωθεν ὁδοῦ.
 τοῦ δὲ λέων ὥρουσε κατὰ στίβον, ἀνδράσι δεῖμα
 θαρσαλέοις, γάλλῳ δ' οὐδ' ὀνομαστὸν ἄχος,
 ὃς τότε ἄναυδος ἔμεινε δέους ὕπο καί τινος αὔρη
 δαίμονος ἐς τὸν ἐὼν τύμπανον ἦκε χέρας· 10
 οὐδ' βαρὺν μυκήσαντος ὁ θαρσαλεώτερος ἄλλων
 τετραπόδων ἐλάφῳ ἔδραμεν ὀξύτερον,
 τὸν βαρὺν οὐ μείνας ἀκοῆς ψόφον· ἐκ δ' ἐβόησεν·
 'Μῆτερ, Σαγγαρίου χεῖλεσι πὰρ ποταμοῦ,
 ἱρὴν σοὶ θαλάμην ζωάγρια καὶ λαλάγημα 15
 τοῦτο τὸ θηρὶ φυγῆς αἷτιον ἀντίθεμαι.'
 (Diosc. AP 6.220 = HE 16)

He wished to reach Sardis from Phrygian Pessinus,
 in frenzy giving his wild hair to the wind,
 chaste Atys, Cybele's bedroom servant, but the fierce
 fervour of his harsh ecstasy was cooled
 when the dark of evening fell upon him in his course, and in a descending
 cavern he took shelter, turning aside a little from the road.
 But a lion came swiftly on his track, a terror to brave
 men and an inexpressible woe for the *gallus*.
 He stood speechless from fear and by some divine
 inspiration put his hand to his drum.
 At its deep roar the most courageous of the other
 beasts ran off quicker than a deer,
 unable to bear the deep note in its ears, and he cried out:
 'Great Mother, by the banks of the Sangarius
 in thanks for my life, my holy shrine and this boisterous
 instrument that caused the lion to fly, I dedicate to you.'

Atys (or Attis), Cybele's god lover, is here identified with a *gallus*—or, alternatively, Atys is the name of a *gallus*.³⁴ He is introduced as *ἀγνός* ('chaste', v. 3) and as Cybele's *θαλαμηπόλος* ('bedroom servant', v. 3). The second term probably points to the total servitude that was typically ascribed to *galli* as a reflection of the barbarian dimension of Cybele's cult. In truth, verses 7 and 8 stress that the *gallus* is not a regular man: the lion is terrifying for brave men, but 'an inexpressible woe' for the *gallus*. The adjective *ἀγνός* is also very peculiar. In all probability, it refers to self-castration, perhaps the most foreign and disquieting feature of the *galli*. But the epithet *ἀγνός*, an introductory and thus memorable description of the *gallus*, focuses only on the consequence of

³⁴ Gow and Page (1965), 2: 247; Gall (1999), 83–4. F. Cairns (2008), 1: 60–1 suggests that the epigram may embody the *aition* and foundation legend of a real sanctuary of Cybele, whose founder was Atys.

this brutal act of self-injury. Although castration does not automatically imply chastity (as Martial 3.81 reminds us),³⁵ Dioscorides chooses to label the inability of the *gallus* to engage in sexual penetration as ‘chastity’, and chastity or purity are surely positive values in religious contexts. Besides, verse 2 mentions the hair tossing, which is ubiquitous evidence of the religious possession and lack of self-control of Cybele’s ministers, and verse 4 emphasizes the typical religious frenzy of the *gallus*. However, in our poem the *θευφορέη* of verse 4 is not a condemnation of the lack of control; rather the unremitting divine possession becomes a basis for life-saving divine inspiration, which leads the *gallus* to ‘put his hand to his drum’ (v. 10). We cannot be sure that Dioscorides was the first to narrate the tale of the *gallus* and the lion, but, whether he invented it or not, he paid special attention to Cybele’s music. Although the music is, of course, in a way, the tool that the goddess uses to save him, the salvation of the *gallus* results in fact from this music—and not, more predictably or banally, from the goddess.

Dioscorides most likely did not invent the plot from scratch, but rather followed the model of Leonidas of Tarentum AP 6.221, which describes shepherds who, thanks to a prayer to Zeus the Saviour, were not devoured by a lion that came to their stable. Leonidas’ epigram is remarkably similar in plot to the small group of epigrams on the *gallus* and the lion, and chronologically precedes all of them. But while the shepherds of Leonidas’ poem successfully entreat Zeus the Saviour to get his help, the *gallus* in Dioscorides AP 6.220 is saved through the inspiration of a *δαίμων* (vv. 9–10), and Cybele remains unnamed. Additionally, the ‘deep sound’ (*βαρύ/τὸν βαρὺν...ψόφον*, vv. 11 and 13), which had a negative implication of unpleasantness in Rhianus AP 6.173.4, becomes here the ‘weapon’ with which the *gallus* saves his life, while the drum, the noisy instrument presented as *λαλάγημα* in verse 15, becomes the real cause of the lion’s flight (v. 16). Dioscorides’ emphasis goes completely to this instrument and its noise, which is the key element of this ritual, but not a miracle sent directly by a deity; it is never explicitly stated that Cybele inspires the idea of using the instrument, and the periphrasis ‘inspired by a *δαίμων*’ (whichever sense of *δαίμων* is meant: personal destiny or generic, unnamed divine power)³⁶ might seem a bit strange in a text about a priest of a specific goddess.³⁷

AP 6.217, which is ascribed to Simonides (= HE 2), also seems to follow the same approach to the story and emphasizes the paradoxical strength with which the *gallus* (though ‘half-woman’ and a ‘slave’ of Rhea/Cybele) is

³⁵ See Beard (2012), 343–4.

³⁶ The phrase ambiguously means ‘fate-sent inspiration’ or ‘inspiration sent by a divine power’.

³⁷ Compare Antist. AP 6.237.5–6 = GPh 1.5–6 (second half of the first century BCE), where the ‘Mother of the Gods’ is said to put in the mind of the *gallus* the idea of beating his timbrel.

endowed, thanks to ‘Cybele’s music’ rather than through her direct intervention. Alcaeus of Messene and Antipater of Sidon also experiment with variations on the idea that Cybele’s music is terribly powerful by focusing on the music rather than on the goddess. In the narrative of Alcaeus of Messene (AP 6.218), Cybele’s music affects even the animals, as in the passage of Apollonius already discussed:³⁸

κειράμενος γονίμην τις ἄπο φλέβα Μητρὸς ἀγύρτης
 Ἰδης εὐδένδρου πρῶνας ἐβουνοβάτει·
 τῷ δὲ λέων ἦντησε πελώριος, ὥς ἐπὶ θοίαν
 χάσμα φέρων χαλεπὸν πειναλέου φάρυγος.
 δείσας δ’ ὠμῆστέω θηρὸς μόνον ἴως ἀνδάξαι,
 τύμπανον ἐξ ἱερᾶς ἐπλατάγησ’ ἐνοπῆς.
 χὼ μὲν ἐνέκλεισεν φονίαν γένυν, ἐκ δὲ τενόντων
 ἔνθους ῥομβητὴν ἐστροφάλιζε φόβην·
 κείνος δ’ ἐκπροφυγὼν ὁλοὸν μόνον εἶσατο Ῥεΐῃ
 θῆρα, τὸν ὀρχησμῶν αὐτομαθῇ Κυβέλης.
 (Alc. Mess. AP 6.218 = HE 21)

A begging eunuch priest of Cybele was wandering
 through the upland forests of Ida,
 and there met him a huge lion, its hungry throat
 dreadfully gaping as though to devour him.
 Then in fear of the death that faced him from the beast (?),
 he beat his drum at the order of a divine voice.
 The lion shut its murderous mouth, and about its neck
 began to toss and whirl its mane, as if full of divine frenzy.
 And he thus escaping a dreadful death dedicated to Rhea
 the beast that had taught itself her dance.

In what may be an implicit *aetiological* explanation of the total submission of lions to the goddess and of their ubiquity in her iconography,³⁹ the noise of the *τύμπανον* does not make the lion run away, but leads it to ‘autodidactically’ imitate the orgiastic dance of Cybele’s worshippers, as it spins its mane like a *ρόμβος* (‘bullroarer’, the typical instrument of Cybele’s music).⁴⁰ In addition, in

³⁸ See p. 217 in this chapter.

³⁹ F. Cairns (2008), 1: 59.

⁴⁰ Bonsignore (2013) maintains that Alcaeus’ description of Cybele’s priest as *μητραγύρτης* is derogatory and the tone of the epigram sarcastic; the epigram would thus be polemical against the initiative of Philip V (as conjectured by Bonsignore) to support and institutionalize Cybele’s cult. Her arguments, though presented with admirable rigour, do not seem persuasive. The term *μητραγύρτης* (together with Cratinus’ *ἀγερακύβηλις*) may simply be an older name for *gallus*, used, not unsurprisingly, in an epigram that is, after Diosc. AP 6.220, the most ancient text on the tale of the *gallus* and the lion (for the probably late chronology of the title *gallus*, see p. 214 in this chapter). Above all, I see no sarcasm in Alcaeus’ epigram. The transformation of the lion may be just another proof of the hyper-miraculous power of Cybele’s music: naive, as almost all descriptions of miracles are, but not sarcastic. In fact it would be totally in tune with the effects of the corybantic dances on animals that are also described by Apollonius of Rhodes (see p. 217 in this chapter).

this case study as well, there is no hint at direct intervention by the goddess. Similarly, Antipater of Sidon AP 6.219 = HE 64 focuses not on Rhea's (= Cybele's) power but on the power of the music of the *gallus*. Here the drum, although presented as 'the arm of Olympian Rhea' (*Ρείας ὄπλον* 'Ολυμπιάδος, v. 20), 'helps to save the life' of the *gallus* (τὸ ζωᾶς ἐπαρωγόν, v. 21), while Rhea herself is represented as being *φρικτός* ('awful', v. 1). Antipater presents a version that drastically marginalizes the goddess, in contrast to Alcaeus of Messene, in whose poem (AP 6.218) at least the dedication made to the goddess keeps the epigram closer to the other variations on the lion story. Here the emphasis is rather on the non-divine, superior power of 'necessity' (vv. 23–4), which can lead to a solution for every problem, and on the (super) natural, life-saving force of the *τύμπανον*, as stressed above.⁴¹ Later in time and isolated in its handling of the story, Antistius AP 6.237 = GPh 1 resumes the story but presents the idea of playing the drum as Cybele's suggestion.

To sum up, apart from Antistius AP 6.237, these epigrams do not emphasize the goddess' power, but they rather advertize the extraordinary effects of the noisy but powerfully salvific music of Cybele's rites. While they frequently refer to this music as 'deep' and 'boisterous' and highlight the disarray that characterizes Cybele's rites and her ministers' conduct, they nevertheless seem to pursue the logic of a 'yes, but' argument that stresses the miraculous effects of Cybele's music on her *gallus*—and also, implicitly but quite relevantly, of her life-saving cult⁴² on her worshippers.

A Latin text that comes chronologically at the end of the long life cycle of the story of the *gallus* and the lion demonstrates that the eulogistic message of this story penetrated Roman culture and implies that it became part of the official 'gospel' of Cybele's cult. As we know from Augustine of Hippo (*Civ. Dei* 7.24), Varro pondered over the symbolic–allegoric values of Cybele's image, and his Menippean *Satires*—in particular his poem *Eumenides*—appear to have paid significant attention to Cybele's cult.⁴³ In another poem of the

⁴¹ The ambitions of originality in this epigram are seen in the removal of the dedicatory form and the unusual length of twenty-four lines (which are interconnected according to F. Cairns 2008, 1: 63: 'the exclusion of a dedication is almost a proclamation of the poet's skill in amplification'; Antipater's epigram would prove that it does not need to reuse this traditional element in order to reach such an unusual length).

⁴² See Sfameni Gasparro (1985), in particular 84–106.

⁴³ This poem includes the narrative of an encounter with Cybele's priests, the *semiviri* ('half-men'), with their *coma volans* ('fluttering hair'; see at least frs 119–20, 131–3, 149–50 Astbury). A character stigmatizes their frenzy as 'a disease' (*insanitas*), wishing to keep the greatest distance from them; alternatively, one of the *galli* stigmatizes the narrator as profane and ignorant of the rites and says 'keep the hell this madness away from our house' (*apage in dierectum a domo nostra istam insanitatem*, fr. 133 Astbury). The idea may have been used by Catullus at 63.92: *procul a mea tuos sit furor omnis, era, domo* ('far be all your fury, o mistress, from my house'), although, significantly, Catullus prescribes the separation of the narrator from the goddess and not that of the goddess from the non-worshippers.

Satires ('*Ovos λύρας*, 'The ass [listens to] the lyre') a character asks his interlocutor (fr. 364 Astbury):

non vidisti simulacrum leonis ad Idam eo loco, ubi quondam subito eum cum vidissent quadrupedem galli tympanis adeo fecerunt mansuem, ut tractarent manibus?

Did you not see the statue of the lion at Ida in that spot where once upon a time, as soon as they caught sight of that animal, the *galli* with their drums made it tame so that they could touch it with their hands?

Unless these words merely demonstrate Varro's familiarity with the epigrams on the *gallus* and the lion and represent his own aetiological interpretation, we may surmise that by his time the story had become more or less a 'vulgate' and the 'official' *aition* for a statue of the lion on Mount Ida.

2. THE *GALLUS* AND THE LION IN CATULLUS 63

Some of these epigrams have been investigated as possible sources for Catullus' poem 63, the longest and perhaps best known literary text that features a *gallus*. Catullus depicts the lion, the usual pet symbol of Cybele, as terrifying poor Attis (a *gallus* or rather Cybele's partner, described as an aetiological-prototypical *gallus*, as in Dioscorides *AP* 6.220); thus he points to Cybele's frightening dominion over her worshippers and priests. Recent scholarship has surmised that Catullus was continuing and varying one or more unknown Hellenistic texts that presented Cybele's cult in its darkest, most frenzied aspects. Accordingly, the epigrams featuring the lion chased away by Cybele's music would be a variation on these unattested Hellenistic texts (or text), reversing the sad end of the supposed original(s) into a happy one for the sake of the unexpected final twist (*aprosdoketon*). Catullus would simply not reverse the sad end of the supposed original(s).⁴⁴ Alternatively (and less plausibly in my opinion), it has been argued that Catullus transformed a Hellenistic *aetiological* poem (epigrammatic or not) on the features of Cybele's priests—for instance, the model of Dioscorides *AP* 6.220—into a more dramatic and psychologically charged story of a youth who became Cybele's victim.⁴⁵

I hope to have shown that the happy ending of the story of the *gallus* and the lion is the linchpin of the subgroup of epigrams that represent Cybele's music as especially powerful. In this way Cybele's music compensates for the *gallus*' effeminacy (stressed ubiquitously) and lack of self-control induced by divine

⁴⁴ Fedeli (1981); Courtney (1985), 90; Newman (1990), 215.

⁴⁵ Gall (1999). See S. Harrison (2005a), 20–2 and Harder (2005) for persuasive reviews of the links between *Attis* and various Greek literary genres.

possession (a feature stressed in Dioscorides' and Antipater's epigrams). Moreover, Cybele's music is exculpated for being boomerily noisy (as is stated or implied in all poems). As a case study of variation, these epigrams exemplify well the important role played by the multiplication of points of view in the history of the technique of epigrammatic variation,⁴⁶ which express a 'multi-vocal unison' of perspectives on their topic that increases its credibility. Rather than being just a lazy repetition that demonstrates the Hellenistic taste for art for art's sake, these epigrams participate in the debate on the orgiastic enthusiasm of Cybele's music and on the dignity of the *galli*. Through the alteration of details and conclusions, they exemplify from how many diverse viewpoints the great power of Cybele's music and of her *galli* can and should be appreciated.

In the investigation of the intertextual relation of these epigrams with Catullus 63, not enough attention has been paid to the fact that the epigrams on the *gallus* and the lion express a voice radically different from that of Catullus' poem. Actually a few of these epigrams, mainly the ones dating from the first century BCE (i.e. those after Rhianus: the epigrams of Erycius, Philip, Thyillus, and the anonymous AP 6.51), are closer to Catullus' negative evaluation and unilateral emphasis on the uncontrolled and paroxysmal frenzy of Cybele's priests; but the opposing appraisal of Cybele's music and priesthood in most of the surviving epigrams proves that two different views existed in Hellenistic Greek culture about these issues. The texts seem to revolve around the central question of the debate. How acceptable was a frenzied emasculated *gallus*,⁴⁷ the frenzy of Cybele's cult, and in particular her boomerily 'dysfunctional' music?

By choosing to address the frenzy of the *galli*, Catullus takes a position in this Hellenistic debate. He opts for a line that is critical of the irrational

⁴⁶ See Fantuzzi (2010).

⁴⁷ In particular Phld. AP 7.222 = *GPh* 26, though almost unparalleled and isolated in its outlook, proves that the castration of the *galli* could be presented in Greek epigram as a lifestyle choice that did not necessarily elicit disgust: ἐνθάδε τῆς τρυφερῆς μαλακὸν ῥέθος, ἐνθάδε κείται | Τρυγόνιον, σαβακῶν ἄνθεμα Σαλμακίδων, | ἥ καλύβη καὶ δοῦμος ἐνέπρεπεν, ἥ φιλοπαίγμων | στωμυλῇ, Μήτηρ ἦν ἐφίλησε θεῶν, | ἥ μούνη στέρξασα τὰ Κύπριδος ἀμφιγυναίων | ὄργια καὶ φίλτρων Λαῖδος ἀψαμένη. | φῦε κατὰ στήλης, ἱερὴ κόνι, τῇ φιλοβάκχῳ | μὴ βάτον, ἀλλ' ἀπαλὰς λευκοῖων κάλυκας ('Here lies the tender body of the delicate girl, here lies Trygonion, devotee of feeble effeminates, (she) through whom hut and assembly gained glory, to whom there was playful chatter, whom the Mother of the Gods loved, she who in a class by herself cherished the Cyprian rites of those all-around women, and helped with Lais' love philtres. O sacred dust, nourish around this stele, for the philobacchic, not prickly shrubbery but tender buds of white violets'; translation from Sider 1997, 178, slightly modified). Verses 3–6 go so far as to celebrate the total femininity achieved by Trygonion through castration, not only in character but also in physical attitude to sex. In this context of appreciation for the acquired femininity of the *gallus*, which sounds provocatively emphatic and is perhaps the main point of the epigram, we should certainly accept in v. 5 the correction ἀμφιγυναίων, 'women in front and back', defended by Sider (1997), 185–6, instead of the mss reading ἀμφὶ γυναικῶν, 'around women'. Philodemus' appreciation of the tender femininity of the *galli* appears to be shared by the speaker of fr. 119 Astbury in Varro's *Eumenides* (see also p. 227 here).

upheaval involved in Cybele's cult—and thus similar to Erycius *AP* 6.234, Philip *AP* 6.94, Thyillus *AP* 7.223, and the anonymous *AP* 6.51—but even exacerbates the negative aspect.⁴⁸ From this perspective, he may be radically reversing the motifs of the epigrams that vary the story of the *gallus* and the lion, which may have raised the beneficial power of Cybele's music to the level of consensus. In fact the drum in Catullus has all the relevance it usually enjoys in Cybele's cult, but its rumble, together with the cymbals and the frenzied dances accompanying the music, is present only in the first part of the poem,⁴⁹ where Attis accomplishes his emasculation. Thus it seems to constitute above all the background noise of Attis' increasing frenzy, channelled through his self-castration and catechizing speech; it is certainly not mentioned as soon as Attis, temporarily 'freed from speeding madness' (v. 44),⁵⁰ starts to have doubts about his action with the new dawn. Likewise, Catullus' Cybele asks her lion to toss its mane dreadfully, thus scaring Attis away ('shake your ruddy mane fiercely from your sinewy neck', v. 83⁵¹), whereas in Alcaeus of Messene *AP* 6.218 it was the lion that tossed its mane upon hearing the music (actually a synecdochical imitation of Cybele's ritual, with special emphasis on music, as we have seen). Quite differently, in Antipater of Sidon *AP* 6.219 the tossing of the hair of the *gallus* was enough to scare the lion,⁵² and more generally the tossing of head and hair was one of the most common motifs in the description of Cybele's priests. In Catullus' text, as has been said correctly, the lion is systematically shown to behave as a *gallus*.⁵³

Furthermore, the lion sent by the goddess roars once it appears. This boisterous sound—'make the whole region resound with your booming roar'

⁴⁸ We shall never know for sure whether Catullus' (or, say, Juvenal's or Martial's) vehemence against eunuchs and *galli*—the ultimate threat to Roman masculinity (C. A. Williams 2010, 140)—had forerunners in Greek culture. Wilamowitz (1879), for instance, suggested that Catullus may have translated a poem in galliambos that has been often ascribed to Callimachus (fr. 761 Pf.). In principle, even the idiosyncratic disapproval of castration may have been the outcome of the close translation of a Greek model, if the poem was 'the product of Catullus' passion for Greek poetry, not his engagement with the cult of the goddess' (see Beard, North, and Price 1998, 1: 165). However, it is plausible that their bias was at least in part connected with the Romans' radical abomination of castration or effeminacy.

⁴⁹ Vv. 8–9 *typanum* and *typanum* ('tambourine'); v. 10 *quatiens... terga tauri cava* ('striking the hollow bull-hide'); v. 18 *citatis erroribus* ('with swift wanderings'); v. 21 *cymbalum sonat vox... typana reboant* ('the cymbal makes its voice loud... the tambourine resounds'); v. 22 *tibicen... canit Phryx curvo grave calamo* ('the Phrygian piper plays low on his curved reed'); v. 24 *sacra sancta acutis ululatus agitant* ('they perform their holy rites with shrill cries'); v. 26 *deceat citatis celerare tripudiis* ('we should haste with quick leaping'); v. 28 *thiasus repente linguis trepidantibus ululat* ('the band suddenly wailed with trembling tongues'); v. 29 *leve tympanum remugit, cava cymbala recrepant* ('the light tambourine boomed, the hollow cymbals crashed'); vv. 31–2 *furibunda... comitata tympano* ('raving... accompanied by the tambourine'). The translations of the excerpts from Catullus are from S. Harrison (2005b). See Morisi (1999), 29–30.

⁵⁰ I.e. *rapida sine rabie* in the text.

⁵¹ I.e. *rutilam ferox torosa cervice quate iubam* in the text.

⁵² As observed already by Morisi (1999), 142–3.

⁵³ See Nauta and Harder (2005), 99.

(v. 82);⁵⁴ ‘roars’ (v. 86)⁵⁵—which drives Attis to live in the wilderness of the woods (vv. 85–90), is the last and most memorable picture of the poem and appears to be a reaction to, and in turn totally reshape, the story of the *gallus* rescued from the lion thanks to Cybele’s music. If the raucous music of the instruments typical of Cybele’s cult saves the life of the epigrammatic *gallus* and leads the lion to run away to the wild (a detail precisely highlighted in ‘Simonides’ *AP* 6.217.8: ἀν’ ὑλῆεν . . . ὄρος), the dreadful roaring of the lion sent by the goddess in Catullus permanently moves Attis away from the beach, whence he might have returned to his fatherland and society (as he had just dreamed of doing: vv. 49–73), and compels him to live in the woods. In verses 70–3, Attis can still perceive the indecency of a life spent in the wilderness, and this feeling seems to trigger the temptation for getting rid of ‘green Ida’ and Cybele: ‘shall I haunt the chilly regions of green Ida, clothed with snow? Shall I spend my life under the lofty peaks of Phrygia, where the hind lives in the woods, where the boar wanders the groves?’⁵⁶ However, because of the lion, he leaves the beach, his only safety net, and shelters forever in the wilderness of the woods:⁵⁷ ‘Attis fled wildly into the savage groves. There without break for the whole of her life she was a handmaid’ (vv. 89–90; Attis’ female gender emphasizes his sexual metamorphosis).⁵⁸ By presenting the lion as triumphantly behaving like the *gallus* of the epigrammatic story of the lion and the *gallus*,⁵⁹ Catullus appears to construct an anti-narrative of this same tale, where the life-saving power of Cybele’s music is neutralized in the most radical way. Catullus never mentions Cybele’s music; the only perceivable noise is the lion’s roar.

3. CONCLUSIONS

In his description of the Roman procession for Magna Mater, Lucretius (2.600–60) presents Cybele’s cult as properly civilized; he does this through

⁵⁴ In the original, *fac cuncta mugienti fremitu loca retonent*. ⁵⁵ I.e. *fremi* in the text.

⁵⁶ The original reads: *ego viridis algida Idae nive amicta loca colam? | ego vitam agam sub altis Phrygiae columinibus, | ubi cerva silvicultrix, ubi aper nemorivagus? | iam iam dolet quod egi, iam iamque paenitet*.

⁵⁷ The woods, *nemus* or *nemora*, are an obsessive presence in Catull. 63, where they occur ten times; see Nauta and Harder (2005), 95.

⁵⁸ The original reads: *illa demens fugit in nemora fera; | ibi semper omne vitae spatium famula fuit*.

⁵⁹ See Nauta and Harder (2005), 99, who also emphasize, suggestively, that the identification of the *galli* and lions might have sounded familiar to Catullus’ readers, as it also occurred (virtually) in Lucretius: at *De rerum natura* 2.632, the followers of Magna Mater are presented with the phrase *terrificas capitum quatientes numine cristas* (‘with a nod shaking the frightful crests on their heads’), which, but for one word, is identical with a description of the lions at 5.1315: *terrificas capitum quatientes undique cristas* (‘on all sides shaking the frightful crests on their heads’).

a series of allegorical interpretations of its most irrational aspects and explicitly points to Greek poetical sources for this allegorical approach (2.600). The identity of these poetical sources remains obscure.⁶⁰ I suggest that the epigrammatic tale of the triumphant *gallus* and the runaway lion may have constituted a parallel and perhaps basic source for these allegorical 'justifications' of Cybele's ecstatic music and rites; through the salvation of the *gallus* from the lion, these poems may have pointed implicitly to the influential power of the cult on the lives and afterlives of Cybele's worshippers.

On the one hand, the tale is an emphatic continuation of cold and critical stances towards the ecstasy of Cybele's cult, as in the epigrams of Rhianus, Erycius, Philip, and Thyillus. On the other hand, the apologetic and eulogistic implications of the story of the *gallus* and the lion, which appear as an established fact in Varro's fragment 364 Astbury, for example, together with Lucretius and the allegorical interpretations of Cybele's religion that Lucretius quotes but that do not survive, became perhaps the fertile background for the vehemence of the Catullan reaction.

Catullus' runaway proto-*gallus* Attis, the triumphant lion, and its roaring seem to neutralize the memory of the life-saving weapon-music celebrated in the Greek epigrams, a music that is simply no longer there to help Attis against the lion. Catullus' reversal of the epigrammatic narrative of the *gallus* and the lion, his silence about any role that Cybele's music could have played against the lion, and his emphasis on the goddess' punitive aggression highlight in the most graphic way the 'distinction' (in Bourdieu's sense) between the psychologizing narrative of Catullus' *carmen doctum* and the positive evaluation of Cybele's music, which—as I hope to have demonstrated—is best known to us from several authors of the epigrammatic genre.

⁶⁰ See most recently Summers (1996), 340–2.

Dreadful Eros, before and after Meleager

Kathryn Gutzwiller

Despite their small size, Hellenistic literary epigrams could at times develop larger themes from Greek literature, especially when anthologized as a series. As an example, I offer a little discussed set of five interrelated epigrams by Meleager on a single theme concerning the god Eros (AP 5.176–80).¹ No other continuous sequence of epigrams by Meleager reaches this length, and the poems appear to have formed an important nodule within the erotic book of his *Garland*.² Serving as a kind of epigrammatic discourse on the nature of love, the sequence reworks themes from earlier Greek poetry, art, and philosophy. By personalizing these themes through the voice of the epigrammatic lover, the poems in turn transmit the tradition about Eros in a format that influenced not only later Greek epigrams but Greek and Latin literature more generally.

The Eros presented in the series is clearly the wilful boy-god who appears in Hellenistic poetry and art, but Meleager also draws extensively on earlier sophistic and philosophical discussions of the god. These *ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι* ('erotic discourses') emerged in the fifth century BCE, in the form of debates on the nature of Eros that arose, at least partly, because the god had played no role in early epic and had received little in way of cult worship in the archaic period.³ Hesiod conceived of Eros as a primal force of nature and placed him beside Earth, as one of the first entities to arise out of Chaos (*Th.* 120).⁴ In archaic and classical art, Eros was depicted as a winged adolescent, sometimes in the company of Aphrodite, but his attributes of torch and bow and his

¹ The unity of the group has often been rendered unclear by editing practices. Gow and Page (1965), for instance, print AP 5.177–8 (*HE* 37–8) separately from the other three epigrams (*HE* 6–8), thus obscuring the length and flow of the sequence. A. R. Longo (2004–5) discusses several of the epigrams, but does so through the lens of particular metaphors found in Meleager's poetry.

² For the position of the five epigrams in the erotic section of the *Garland*, now divided into Books 5 and 12 of the *Greek Anthology*, see Gutzwiller (1998), 295 (with Table II there).

³ On the *ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι*, see Lasserre (1944); for Eros' history in poetry and cult, see Lasserre (1946); Fasce (1977); Breitenberger (2007), 137–94.

⁴ West (1966) ad loc.; Most (2013).

nature as a child developed mainly in the early Hellenistic era. The type of subject addressed in the ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι was generally Eros' psychological effect as it related to his physical appearance rather than his role as a cosmic force. Surviving examples of such discourse—Gorgias' *Helena*, Plato's *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*,⁵ Xenophon's *Symposium* and *Cyropaedia* (5.1.1–18), and Pseudo-Demosthenes' *Eroticus*—are familiar texts, while titles from lost works reveal the continuing popularity of the topic in the philosophy of the later fourth century BCE and the Hellenistic era.⁶

Also influential for Meleager's sequence are monologues from Greek comedy, which indicate widespread knowledge of philosophical discussions about Eros. In fragments from Eubulus' *Kampylion* (fr. 40 K–A) and Alexis' *Apokoptomenos* (fr. 20 K–A), painters are accused of being ignorant of the god's true being on the grounds that they wrongly depict him with wings. In Alexis' *Phaedrus* (fr. 247 K–A) a character who expressly draws on *topoi* found in philosophical discourse reflects on the mistake of painting Eros at all, since he is neither male nor female, neither god nor human, neither stupid nor wise, but a composite of many forms. Mythical accounts of the god also appear in comedy, as in a fragment of Aristophanes' *Pythagoristes* (fr. 11 K–A) that contains a story of the Olympians shearing Eros of his wings to banish him from heaven. The identity of the comic monologue speakers is unknown and they are not necessarily young men in love. They do, however, suggest models for the lover's voice in our sequence. Meleager was also influenced by the more developed mythical narratives of Eros found in well-known Hellenistic sources, such as Apollonius' *Argonautica* (3.83–166, 275–98) and poems about Eros in the later bucolic corpus, especially Moschus' *Eros drapetes* (*Eros in Flight*). These poems contributed the motif of Aphrodite's difficulty in controlling her unruly son and narrative descriptions of the psychological effects of Eros' arrows to stimulate desire.

This abbreviated survey of philosophical discourse on Eros and its reflection in comedy and Hellenistic poetry indicates the richness of the background upon which Meleager drew in constructing his sequence. The five-epigram set on Eros is unified by a clear structure as well as by recurring motifs, which include the god's laugh, questions about his parentage, and the paradoxes of his being. In offering a reading of these epigrams as a poetic unit, I shall focus on their connections to one another, the reworking of earlier discourse on Eros, and the presence of themes taken up in later texts. Cumulative evidence for Meleager's adaptation of earlier reflection on Eros' nature and the

⁵ On the philosophical and poetic sources for *eros* imagery in the *Phaedrus*, see D. Cairns (2013).

⁶ Lost works include Aristotle's *Erotica* or *Eroticus* (frs 1.15.95–8 Rose); Theophrastus' *Eroticus* (frs 107–9 Wimmer) and *On Love* (fr. 113)—perhaps one and the same work (cf. frs 114–15); Ariston of Ceos' *Erotic Comparisons* (frs 17–24 Wehrli 6); Clearchus of Soli's *Erotica* (frs 21–35 Wehrli 3); Cleanthes' *On Love* (SVF 1.481).

influence of the five epigrams on later Greek and Latin texts will indicate that Meleager's sequence was a linchpin in the adaptation of philosophical discussion on Eros to representations of the internal, emotional experience of the lover.

In the first epigram an unnamed lover, who is most naturally identified with the poet, engages in a generalizing reflection on his long familiarity with Eros' power and cruelty:

δεινὸς Ἔρως, δεινός. τί δὲ τὸ πλέον, ἦν πάλιν εἶπω
καὶ πάλιν οἰμῶζων πολλάκι· 'δεινὸς Ἔρως';
ἦ γὰρ ὁ παῖς τούτοισι γέλῳ καὶ πυκνὰ κακισθεὶς
ῥέσσεται· ἦν δ' εἶπω λοιδόρα, καὶ τρέφεται.
θαῦμα δέ μοι πῶς ἄρα διὰ γλαυκοῖο φανείσα
κύματος, ἐξ ὕγρου, Κύπρι, σὺ πῦρ τέτοκας.

5

(Mel. AP 5.176 = HE 6)

Dreadful is Eros, dreadful. But what's the point of wailing
and saying again and again, dreadful is Eros?

The boy just laughs at these words and takes pleasure in repeated
criticism. If I revile him, he grows even stronger.

I'm amazed how it was that you, Cypris, who arose
through a blue wave, gave birth from moisture to fire.⁷

The lover's opening cry—δεινὸς Ἔρως, δεινός—is apparently uttered in the throes of some unspecified emotional crisis and leads to his realization that such reproaches are useless. The failure to stem love's power with complaint is then more calmly dealt with through a fantasy about the god's reaction to verbal abuse—laughter, pleasure, and an increase in strength. Finally, the lover's mood shifts to wonder at the paradox of Eros' genealogy—at how fire was birthed from water, a theme to which the poet returns in the final poem in the sequence.

The epithet δεινός in the opening reproach, repeated both in the present moment and in remembrance of past occasions, is a traditional one for the god. Alcaeus (fr. 327.1 V) refers to Eros as the 'most dreadful of the gods' (δεινότατον θεῶν), and Eros is called δεινός in both Euripides (*Hipp.* 28, *Andromeda* TrGF 138a) and Plato (*Tht.* 169c1). A close equivalent, *saevus Amor* ('cruel Love'), appears frequently in Latin poetry. In the song of Damon in Vergil's *Eclogues* 8, for example, the despairing lover, who contemplates suicide, declares that he has come to understand the god's nature as a *saevus Amor* (v. 47) of murderous cruelty. The point of Meleager's sequence is much the same: to reveal an understanding of Eros' character that is based on the bitter lover's experience of him and on assumptions about his unusual

⁷ The text of Meleager and all translations are my own.

origins.⁸ Damon's further description of the god in comparison with his cruel mother—*an puer improbus ille? | improbus ille puer* ('Or is that naughty boy [more cruel]? It is the naughty boy', vv. 49–50)—recalls directly the repetitive opening of Meleager's sequence: *δεινὸς Ἔρως, δεινός . . . | δεινὸς Ἔρως*.

The motif of the god's laughter, which is identified in the second couplet as his habitual response to the lover's reproaches, is surprisingly rare in earlier sources. It does appear in Moschus' *Eros drapetes*, where laughter, tears, and kisses are tricks used by Eros to escape capture (vv. 25–7).⁹ Among later examples is an epigram by Crinagoras in which Eros is bound and reviled, a treatment justified on the basis that the god responds to mortal pain with laughter (*Ἔρως, τὰ θνητῶν δ' ἐστὶ σοι γέλως ἄχρη*, 'the pains of mortals are the source of your laughter', *AP* 199.7 = *GPh* 50.7). The same motif appears in the fragmentary novel *Metiochus and Parthenope* (col. 2.46 Stephens/Winkler; no later than the first century CE), in a debate on the nature of Eros between two lovers who argue whether he is a psychological force or the embodied god depicted by poets and artists. Later, in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* (2.4.4, 2.5.1), Eros laughs at the old Philetas, who mistakes him for a mortal boy raiding his garden.

Meleager's emphasis on Eros' laughter, which features in all five epigrams, most likely influenced the motif of Cupid's laughter in key Ovidian poems. In *Amores* 1.1, Cupid reportedly turned the poet from epic to elegy by laughing and snatching away one foot (*risisse Cupido | dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem*, 'Cupid is said to have laughed and snatched away one foot', vv. 3–4). The presence of *dicitur* here signals a source, and an additional hint at Meleager's *δεινὸς Ἔρως* sequence is Ovid's address to the god as *saeve puer* ('[you] cruel child', v. 5). Similarly, in *Amores* 1.6 Ovid reports that, when he was still inexperienced in love, Cupid laughed softly in his ear (*risit, ut audirem*, 'he laughed so that I might hear', v. 11) and predicted his later boldness in night-time visits to a mistress' house. In *Amores* 2.18, when Ovid tries to desert elegy for tragedy, Amor laughs at his stage costume (*risit Amor*, 'Amor laughed', v. 15) and triumphs over the deluded poet. Ovid's repeated programmatic use of Cupid's laughter as a marker of his generic choice to write love elegy apparently derived, directly or indirectly, from its recurrent presence in Meleager's sequence.

⁸ Cf. *AP* 5.176.5–6, 5.177.5–6, and 5.180 with *Ecl.* 8.43–5: *nunc scio quid sit Amor: duris in cotibus illum | aut Tmaros aut Rhodope aut extremi Garamantes | nec generis nostri puerum nec sanguinis edunt* ('Now I know what Eros is: Tmarus or Rhodope or the furthest Garamantes brought forth that boy of neither our race nor blood'). Theoc. *Id.* 3.15–16 and 7.76–7 provide models for both Meleager and Vergil, so that the epigrams function as intermediary texts in the Latin reception of the motif; see p. 245 in this chapter.

⁹ Moschus' poem was clearly known to Meleager, since it served as a primary model for *AP* 5.177, as shown below.

The final couplet in AP 5.176 reduces a long history of arguments about Eros' origin to the conceit of Aphrodite, born from the sea, giving birth to fire from the watery element. The poet here integrates through his oxymoronic imagery the normally conflicting stories about Eros as Aphrodite's son, as an elemental force of cosmic dimensions or as an irresolvable paradox—the latter being a focus of sophistic discourse on the god. As the third-century BCE poet Antagoras proclaims in a poem said to reflect the teachings of the Academic philosopher Crantor (CA 1 p. 120 = D.L. 4.26–7), there existed two versions of Eros' origin. According to one, he was among the first of the gods brought forth by Erebus and Night from the depths of Ocean, and according to the other, he was the son of Aphrodite, Earth, or the Winds. By claiming at the beginning of his sequence that Aphrodite gives birth to Eros from the sea's moisture, Meleager melds these elements to reflect the god's power and elusiveness.

Meleager's five-epigram sequence has a clear structure, the first and the last poems framing the central three. In both AP 5.176 and 5.180 the poet-lover speaks *about Eros* in a tone of resigned reflection; the poems are also linked thematically by their final couplets, which concern the god's origin in fire and water. By contrast, the three poems in between, each containing an address *to Eros*, seem to represent earlier moments in time, when the lover tried vainly to escape the god's power; they may thus be read as examples of his earlier reproaches, the *λοῖδορα* mentioned in AP 5.176.4. These central three poems also have distinct structural similarities, each being ten lines long and each ending with verbally similar appeals to the god, placed metrically in the same position (καίτοι κείνος, ἰδοῦ, AP 5.177.9; καίτοι λίσσεται, ἰδοῦ, AP 5.178.9; καίτοι . . . ἄλλ' ἔθι, δυσνίκητε, AP 5.179.7–9). AP 5.177 and 5.178 are mime-like poems often treated as an epigram pair. In both, the lover engages in role-playing, first taking on the persona of a slave owner who proclaims the loss of a runaway child and then that of an auctioneer who tries to sell the baby Eros. Both end with an acknowledgement of the god's close relationship to Zenophila, who provides the only example of a love object in this epigram sequence that as a whole deals generically with the lover's plight. Role-playing is replaced in AP 5.179 by the lover's fantasy of an actual conversation with Eros. He begins by threatening the god with physical harm but is unnerved by Eros' sneering laugh; in the end he asks only for the god's departure—a vain hope that sets up the concluding epigram, with its acknowledgement of Eros' invincibility and cruelty.

The second poem in the sequence mimics proclamations made by the owner or by a crier to recover runaway slaves:

κηρύσσω τὸν Ἔρωτα τὸν ἄγριον ἄρτι γάρ, ἄρτι
 ὀρβρινὸς ἐκ κοίτας ὥχεται ἀποπτάμενος.
 ἔστι δ' ὁ παῖς γλυκύδακρυς, αἰλίλαλος, ὠκύς, ἀθαμβής,
 σιμὰ γελῶν, πτερόεις, νῶτα φαρετροφόρος.

πατρός δ' οὐκέτ' ἔχω φράζειν τίνος· οὔτε γὰρ Αἰθήρ,
οὐ Χθών φησι τεκεῖν τὸν θρασύν, οὐ Πέλαγος.
πάντη γὰρ καὶ πᾶσιν ἀπέχθεται. ἀλλ' ἐσορᾶτε
μή που νῦν ψυχαῖς ἄλλα τίθησι λῖνα.
καίτοι κείνος, ἰδοῦ, περὶ φωλεόν. οὔ με λέληθας,
τοξότα, Ζηνοφίλας ὄμμασι κρυπτόμενος.
(Mel. AP 5.177 = HE 37)

I announce the loss of Eros, the savage, who just now, just
before dawn, departed from his bed under wing.
He's that boy of sweet tears, a non-stop talker, swift, undaunted,
smug when laughing, winged, with a quiver on his back.
I'm not able to name any father, since neither Aether nor Earth
admit to being the rascal's parent, nor the Sea.
That's because he's hated everywhere by everyone. But check around
to make sure he's not perhaps now casting other nets for souls.
And look, there he is by his lair. You haven't escaped me,
archer, by hiding in the eyes of Zenophila.

Actual proclamations surviving in papyri include this example from second-century BCE Alexandria: 'A slave disappeared in Alexandria, by the name Hermon and also called Neilus, in origin a Syrian from Bambyce, eighteen years old, of average height, beardless, with strong calves, a dimpled chin, a wart by the left nostril, a scar on the left side of the mouth, tattooed on the right wrist with two barbarian letters . . . wearing a cloak and waist cloth.'¹⁰ Prose versions in later literary authors (Petron. 97.1–2, on Giton; Apul. *Met.* 6.7–8, on Psyche; Luc. *Fug.* 27–8, on Cynics) confirm that the format of the papyrus announcement is standard, typically including (1) the owner, (2) the slave's name and ethnic, (3) a physical description, and (4) a promise of reward for turning in the runaway. In his second couplet Meleager adapts this sort of physical description to a staccato listing of elements pertaining to Eros' character and appearance. The information usual in such proclamations about a slave's ethnic origin is remodelled in the third couplet as the problem of whether Eros had a father, and, if so, who or what that father was. Archaic poets invented divine parents for Eros in so many conflicting versions that Phaedrus in Plato's *Symposium* concluded the god had no mother or father (178b).¹¹ Meleager personalizes this tradition by asserting that three alleged progenitors—Aether, Earth, and Sea—deny parentage, not necessarily because none of them *is* Eros' parent but because they all share a universal hatred of him. In so doing, the poet simultaneously recalls

¹⁰ UPZ 1.121 = Scholl (1990), no. 81: παῖς ἀνακεχώρηκεν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἑρμῶν, ὃς καὶ Νεῖλος καλεῖται, τὸ γένος Σύρος ἀπὸ Βαμβύκης ὡς ἐτῶν ιη, μεγέθει μέσος, ἀγένειος, εὐκνημος, κοιλογένειος, φακὸς παρὰ ῥίνα ἐξ ἀριστερῶν, οὐλὴ ὑπὲρ χαλινὸν ἐξ ἀριστερῶν, ἐστιγμένος τὸν δεξιὸν καρπὸν γράμμασι βαρβαρικοῖς δυνσί, ἔχων . . . περὶ τὸ σῶμα χλαμύδα καὶ περίζωμα.

¹¹ Lasserre (1946), 130–49; LIMC III.1 ('Eros'), pp. 850–1.

Presocratic accounts of Eros as a cosmic source and alludes to the uncertain reliability of those accounts; cowed by Eros' power, even the universalizing components of the physical world refuse to acknowledge his origin.

The lover's role-playing as a herald is also indebted to Moschus' *Eros drapetes*, where Aphrodite proclaims Eros a runaway and promises the reward of a kiss for his capture. Both poems begin with the language of proclamation (μακρὸν ἐβώσσει, 'cried loudly for', Mosch. 1.1; κηρύσσω, 'I proclaim', AP 5.177.1), and the phrase with which Meleager introduces his description of the lost boy in the second couplet, ἔστι δ' ὁ παῖς γλυκύδακρυς, closely echoes the opening of the similar, though longer description given by Aphrodite (ἔστι δ' ὁ παῖς περίσσιμος, 'the boy is very recognizable', v. 6). The goddess concludes with a warning to avoid the dangers of the boy's tricks and weapons (vv. 24–9), and Meleager's lover similarly issues a warning to beware of Eros' nets for snaring souls (vv. 7–8).¹² Particularly Meleagrian, however, is the final twist that emerges as Eros is seen hiding in Zenophila's eyes. In this Meleager seems indebted to an epigram by Callimachus (AP 12.73 = HE 4) in which half of the poet's soul has run away (δρῆσιν, v. 4), gone off to some boy. I suspect that Callimachus' last words, 'I know that it loiters somewhere there' (οἶδ' ὅτι που στρέφεται, v. 6), lie behind Meleager's ending, 'you haven't escaped me, archer, hiding in Zenophila's eyes' (vv. 9–10). Meleager's shift turns the proclamation format into a mini-drama through the speaker's internal emotional change.¹³ It reveals that the poem has from the outset been only the lover's internal discourse about loss and renewal of desire, play-acted as an allegory of the runaway Eros.

The companion epigram is modelled on the language of an auctioneer (κῆρυξ) selling off a slave child.¹⁴ It has the same general structure, with verbal similarities,¹⁵ and the same emotional arc from frustration with the boy-slave Eros to acquiescence in his power:

πωλείσθω, καὶ ματρός ἔτ' ἐν κόλποισι καθεύδων·
 πωλείσθω. τί δέ μοι τὸ θρασὺ τοῦτο τρέφειν;
 καὶ γὰρ σιμὸν ἔφην καὶ ὑπόπτερον· ἄκρα δ' ὄνυξιν
 κνίξει· καὶ κλαῖον πολλὰ μεταξὺ γελᾷ.
 πρὸς δέ, τί λοιπόν; ἄθρεπτον, ἀεὶ λαλόν, ὅξ' ἐν δεδορκός,
 ἄγριον, οὐδ' αὐτῇ μητρὶ φίλῃ τιθασόν.

5

¹² On the use of 'net' as an erotic metaphor, see Ibyc. PMGF 287.3–4; Dicaeogenes TrGF fr. 1b.1; Theoc. Id. 27.17; anon. AP 11.52; Plaut. Trin. 237; Tib. 1.6.5; Ov. Ars am. 3.554.

¹³ On Meleager's dramatization of emotional change, see Gutzwiller (2007b), 326–32.

¹⁴ Contracts on papyri from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt show that selling very young children, whether born as slaves, captured in war, or picked up as foundlings, was common; see Scholl (1990), no. 37; Straus (2004), 262–8.

¹⁵ Shared vocabulary includes ἀεὶ λαλόν, AP 5.177.3 and 5.178.5; σιμὰ ~ σιμόν, AP 5.177.4 and 5.178.3; γελῶν ~ γελᾷ, AP 5.177.4 and 5.178.4; πάντῃ ~ πάντα, AP 5.177.7 and 5.178.7; καίτοι... ἰδοῦ, AP 5.177.9 and 5.178.9.

πάντα τέρας. τοιγὰρ πεπράσεται. εἴ τις ἀπόπλους
 ἔμπορος ὠνεῖσθαι παῖδα θέλει, προσίτω.
 καίτοι λίσσεται, ἰδοῦ, δεδακρυμένος. οὐ σ' ἔτι πωλῶ·
 θάρσει· Ζηνοφίλα σύντροφος ὦδε μένε.

10

(Mel. AP 5.178 = HE 38)

Let him be sold, though he still sleeps in his mother's lap.
 Let him be sold. What's the point of rearing this brat?
 For he was born snub-nosed and winged. He scratches with just the
 tip of his nails. When weeping, he often starts laughing.
 What else is there? He's beyond educating, a non-stop talker, sharp-eyed,
 wild, and never obedient to his very own mother.
 A complete monster. So he will be sold. If some merchant departing
 by ship wants to buy a boy, let him come forward.
 And yet, look, he weeps and begs. Alright, I won't sell you.
 Cheer up. Stay here, a foster-brother for Zenophila.

Literary accounts, the fullest being the parody of a slave sale in Lucian's *Sale of Philosophical Lives* (*Bion prasis*), reveal the format of such auctions. The crier's description of the slave's qualities and competencies is mimicked in the second and third couplets, and a call to buyers with particular needs is the model for the fourth couplet. The description of Eros is, however, entirely negative, and the speaker calls for a buyer only in order to find a trader who will take the child far away. Given Meleager's early career as a writer of prose works called *Charites* composed in the manner of his countryman Menippus' satires (AP 7.417.4 = HE 2.4, AP 7.418.5–6 = HE 3.5–6), it is hard to resist the assumption that a principal model for the auction of Eros was Menippus' *Sale of Diogenes* (*Diogenous prasis*).¹⁶ Diogenes Laertius (6.29) cites Menippus as a principal source for the story of Cynic Diogenes' sale into slavery,¹⁷ and anecdotes about what was said at the auction were a prominent part of the biographical tradition about Diogenes.¹⁸ In Lucian's *Sale of Philosophical Lives* the auction of a Cynic *bios* modelled on the persona of Diogenes is thought to be loosely based on Menippus' *Sale of Diogenes*. Given that Lucian's *The Runaways* (*Drapetai*) includes a proclamation for runaway Cynic philosophers, both AP 5.177 and 5.178 must have had a parallel in Lucian, which suggests that Menippus was a common source adapted by both Meleager in epigram and Lucian in dialogue. Just as the inversion of master and slave is an underlying theme in the anecdotes about Diogenes at auction, so too in

¹⁶ An auction scene occurred also in Euripides' satiric *Syleus* (686a–94 TrGF), where Heracles was sold by Hermes; and a comic auction scene in Plautus' *Stichus* (218–33) was possibly adapted from the Greek original—Menander's *Adelphoi* α (also called *Philadelphoi*).

¹⁷ He also mentions a *Sale of Diogenes* by Eubulus (D.L. 6.30). See Helm (1906), 231–53; Giannantoni (1990), 453–60.

¹⁸ Ph. *Quod omnis probus liber sit* 121–4; Crates Theb. *Ep.* 34; Gell. 2.18.9; Clem.Al. *Paed.* 3.3.16.1.

AP 5.178 the lover, again by a change of heart in the final couplet, becomes slave to his slave Eros.¹⁹

The next epigram, while closely related structurally and in length to the two preceding ones, is not a mime but a dramatized conversation with the god that offers a continuation of the lover's emotional journey:

ναὶ τὰν Κύπριν, Ἔρως, φλέξω τὰ σὰ πάντα πυρώσας,
 τόξα τε καὶ Σκυθικὴν ἰοδόκον φαρέρηρην.
 φλέξω, ναὶ . . . τί μάταια γελᾷς καὶ σιμὰ σεσηρῶς
 μυχθίζεις; τάχα πον σαρδάνιον γελάσεις.
 ἦ γάρ σευ τὰ ποδηγὰ Πόθων ὠκύπτερα κόψας
 χαλκόδετον σφίγξω σοῖς περὶ ποσσὶ πέδην.
 καίτοι Καδμείον κράτος οἴσομεν, εἴ σε πάροικον
 ψυχῇ συζεύξω, λύγκα παρ' αἰπολίοις.
 ἀλλ' ἴθι, δυσνίκητε, λαβὼν δ' ἔπι κοῦφα πέδιλα
 ἐκπέτασον ταχινᾶς εἰς ἑτέρους πτέρνγας.
 (Mel. AP 5.179 = HE 7)

By Cypris, I shall ignite and burn all your weapons, Eros,
 including your bow and Scythian arrow-holding quiver.
 I shall burn them, by . . . Why do you give that useless laugh and snort
 with a smug grin? Soon perhaps, your laugh will turn grimace.
 That's because I'll clip your wing-feathers, the guides of Desire,
 and fasten on your feet a chain bound with bronze.
 And yet it's a Cadmean victory I'll gain, if I yoke you as neighbour
 to my soul, a lynx beside the goat pasture.
 Go then, forever the victor; put on your light sandals and
 spread your swift wings in the direction of others.

As both mimes end with an acknowledgement of Eros' continuing physical presence, so this epigram presents the frustrated lover's attempt to control the child-god by threat of force. The physical immediacy of Eros, of desire itself, is made evident as the lover apostrophizes the god's laughter and sneering grin in response to the initial threat to burn his weapons.²⁰ The next threat, to clip his wings and bind his feet, leads to the realization that such an action would only result in yoking the god to his own soul.²¹ In the final couplet the defeated lover begs Eros to fly away to others, with a link back to the opening of

¹⁹ On the sale of Eros in art, see Gutzwiller (2010b), 83–4. The sale of a wax image of Eros appears in *Anacreont.* 11.

²⁰ The smug sneer that accompanies Eros' laugh is present in all three central epigrams, but most prominently here: *σιμὰ γελῶν*, AP 5.177.4; *σιμὸν ἔφην*, AP 5.178.3; *τί μάταια γελᾷς καὶ σιμὰ σεσηρῶς | μυχθίζεις*, AP 5.179.3–4. At 'Theoc.' *Id.* 20.11–15, a similar description is applied to a girl who rejects a cowherd's advances. For discussion of the motif, see A. R. Longo (2004–5), 341–3.

²¹ Called a 'Cadmean victory', which is like a Pyrrhic victory (cf. Hdt. 1.166; Pl. *Lg.* 641c; *Suda* κ 17–18).

AP 5.177, where Eros has just flown from his bed. This ring composition reinforces the resemblance between the central three epigrams.

The lover's threats of violence in AP 5.179 have precedents in earlier mythical narratives, where there are attempts to control Eros. These are made, however, by gods, not by mortals. The threat to burn the god's bow and quiver is reminiscent of the passage in the *Argonautica* where Aphrodite reports to Hera and Athena such great frustration with her son's insolence that she has often felt an urge 'to break his bow and ill-twang arrows' (*Argon.* 3.95–7). Meleager's further threat to clip Eros' wings recalls the fragment of Aristophon's *Pythagoristes* (fr. 11 K–A) where the twelve gods are commended for banishing Eros to heaven and clipping his wings so that he cannot return. Only here, in this sequence, does the lover address Eros throughout, creating an internal dialogue with his desire. The technique resembles speeches in comedy in which characters express their emotions through a conversation with a mute character. Influenced by Meleager's epigram, Ovid takes this approach one step further in *Amores* 1.1 and in the opening lines of the *Remedia amoris* (vv. 1–40); in both proems, the poet reports past conversations with Cupid, quoting not only his own words but also the god's replies.²² In the earlier poem Ovid is testifying to the god's control over his choice of erotic elegy, while in the later one he recasts Meleager's painful and destructive Eros into a more peaceful deity whose power can be moderated. This motif of a peaceful, unarmed, and kind Eros is found also in some Greek epigrams of the later imperial period.²³

Meleager's threats recall a number of ecphrastic motifs that suggest a link to a series of epigrams about a Hellenistic sculpture of the god tied to a pillar (*API* 195–9).²⁴ In what is likely the earliest of the five epigrams (*API* 196 = *HE* 19), by the Alcaeus who was anthologized in Meleager's *Garland*, the viewer concludes by proclaiming the uselessness of the sculptor's labour in trying to

²² Barchiesi (2003), 45–6, has shown that at *Rem. am.* 699–702 Ovid inverts Meleager's conversation with Eros, such as by refusing to cut his wings, and in the proem to that work he reverses Meleager's use of the Ares figure in AP 5.180. Motti (2004) sees the proem of the *Amores* as an allusion, through Propertius 1.1, to Meleager's AP 12.101 = *HE* 103.

²³ See Pall. *API* 207, where the laugh of an unarmed Eros is now gentle, not bitter; Marian. *API* 201, where Eros has lost his old attributes but gained the torch of learning and garlands of wisdom; anon. *API* 202, where a country Eros aids cultivation and wears crowns given by the four Seasons.

²⁴ For discussion, see Gutzwiller (2010b), 72–6. Images of an Eros with clipped wings and hands bound or feet shackled are present in the artistic record from the Hellenistic period: a bronze statuette in Paris (*LIMC* 'Eros', no. 426a = 'Eros/Amor, Cupido', no. 73; cf. no. 76) depicts an Eros with bound hands and apparently clipped wings. A statuette known from several copies depicts Eros with feet shackled, weeping, and sometimes without wings (Curtius 1930, fig. 3a–b, Pl. III = *LIMC* 'Eros/Amor, Cupido', no. 78, same type as no. 77). A shackled Eros leans on a mattock in a cameo attributed to the early Augustan master Aulus in which he is apparently being forced to do a slave's work (Vollenweider 1966, 40–1, Taf. 31.5 = *LIMC* 'Eros/Amor, Cupido', no. 82; cf. nos 81, 83–4 and the first-century BCE example in Spier 2001, no. 16).

fetter Eros and deprive him of his bow and arrows; and in a later epigram by Satyrus (*AP* 195) the viewer surmises that the artist, like Meleager in *AP* 5.179, had been Eros' victim. Meleager plays neither the role of the sculptor trying to bind an Eros who tortures him nor that of the viewer of the statue. Rather his fantasy of escaping love's pain by restraining the god's power situates the reader more intimately within the lover's emotionally dominated thought pattern.

The epigram's oblique relationship to pictorial representations of Eros points, however, to another Latin elegy, and that is Propertius 2.12. Propertius begins by praising the painter of the boy-god, who 'saw' (*vidit*, v. 3) the nature of lovers and depicted Amor accordingly, with wings, arrows, and quiver. At the mid-point of the elegy, the poet reveals that his analysis of the painter's skill is based on personal experience:

*in me tela manent; manet et puerilis imago;*²⁵
sed certe pennas perdidit ille suas;
evolat heu nostro quoniam de pectore nusquam.
 (Prop. 2.12.13–15)

His weapons remain in me, and an image of the boy also remains.
 But he has clearly lost his wings,
 since, alas, he never flies from my heart.

Since it is more characteristic of Eros to flit from one heart to another,²⁶ Propertius' complaint that Eros never flies away may directly recall Meleager's reversal of the older motif, which appears at the end of our epigram.²⁷ Particularly of interest is Propertius' shift to a direct address of the god, as in *AP* 5.179 and its Ovidian imitations:

quid tibi iucundum est siccis habitare medullis?
si pudor est, alio traice tela tua!
 (Prop. 2.12.17–18)

Why do you enjoy dwelling in dried up marrow?
 If you blush at that, point your weapons at another.

In begging Amor to cast his arrows against another, he compounds the reminiscence of Meleager's last couplet by imitating its useless command. Propertius' final ploy is to point out that, if Amor destroys him, there will be no one to sing erotic elegies like his, and the poem's conclusion reveals that

²⁵ The *puerilis imago* is based on another Meleagrian epigram where the despairing lover proclaims that there always resides in his heart a known image (*γνωστός . . . τύπος*, *AP* 5.212.4 = *HE* 10.4), by which he means the familiar impression made by recurrent desire. For the topos, see also Paul. Sil. *AP* 5.274.3–4.

²⁶ E.g. Mosch. 1.16–17.

²⁷ The god's refusal to depart appears also at Mel. *AP* 5.212.5–6 = *HE* 10.5–6 and became the focus of an epigram by Paul the Silentiary (*AP* 5.268).

the real source of Amor's power is the physical reality of the *puella* herself—her head, fingers, dark eyes, and delicate walk (2.12.23–4). In addition to Propertius' motifs adumbrated in AP 5.179, the turn from complaint about the god to submission to the beloved at the poem's end reworks the kind of twist that is found at the end of AP 5.177 and 5.178. It appears, then, that Propertius 2.12 is indebted not just to AP 5.179 but to the preceding paired epigrams as well, indicating his awareness of this sequence as a whole. In Meleager's sequence, the conclusion of AP 5.179 signals the end of the lover's willingness to play Eros' game, and hence prepares for the final poem in the series, where Eros is stripped of allure and remodelled as a god of destruction.

The last epigram has an evident summary quality:

τί ξένον, εἰ βροτολοιγὸς Ἔρως τὰ πυρίπνοα τόξα
βάλλει καὶ λαμυροῖς ὄμμασι πικρὰ γελᾷ;
οὐ μάτηρ στέργει μὲν Ἄρη, γαμέτις δὲ τέτυκται
Ἀφαιστοῦ, κοινὰ καὶ πυρὶ καὶ ξίφεσι;
ματρός δ' οὐ μάτηρ ἀνέμων μᾶστιξι Θάλασσα
τραχὺ βοᾷ; γενέτας δ' οὔτε τις οὔτε τινός.
τοῦνεκεν Ἀφαιστοῦ μὲν ἔχει φλόγα, κύμασι δ' ὄργαν
στέρεξεν ἴσαν, Ἄρεως δ' αἵματόφυρτα βέλη.

5

(Mel. AP 5.180 = HE 8)

What's odd if man-destroying Eros casts fire-breathing arrows
and laughs bitterly with his wanton eyes?
Doesn't his mother adore Ares, and isn't she wife to Hephaestus,
so that she's shared by both fire and sword?
And doesn't his mother's mother, the Sea, bellow hoarsely under
the winds' lash? He has no father, nor father's father.
For these reasons he possesses Hephaestus' flame and cherishes anger
welling up like waves and Ares' blood-smeared weapons.

The opening question, which asks rhetorically why it would be strange that 'man-slaying' Eros hurls fire-breathing arrows and laughs, bitterly links back to other epigrams in the sequence. The phrase *τί ξένον* recalls *τί δὲ τὸ πλέον* in the first line of AP 5.176, the blazing arrows recall the empty threat to burn the god's weapons that opens AP 5.179, and the god's laughter is a leitmotif throughout. The last poem also answers the recurring question about the god's parents (AP 5.176.5–6, 5.177.5–7), by revealing that he has only a matrilineal genealogy: a mother, Aphrodite, and a grandmother, the Sea. The lover again reflects on the nature of Eros, as in AP 5.176, and the epigram may be read as a return to the same dramatic time frame as in that initial poem, a time when reproaches and threats have ended and the lover has come to contemplate Eros' power and cruelty with resigned acceptance.

The main idea of the poem is to explain that Eros' affinity to fire and swords and his savage temperament derive from Aphrodite's sexual relationships with Ares and Hephaestus and are due to her birth from the raging sea.

The compound *βροτολοιγός* in the first line, a Homeric epithet of Ares, signals the key role played by that god,²⁸ and the final phrase, *αἵματόφυρτα βέλη*, which contains a unique compound, suggests that Ares' 'blood-smeared weapons' serve as a precedent for Eros' deadly barbs. The paradoxical likeness of the god of love to the god of war appears only occasionally in later epigram. One example is the anonymous *AP* 9.157 = *FGE* 85, presumably of imperial date, where Eros' divinity is denied on the basis of his cruelty, since he smiles at human bloodshed, holds a sword in his hand, and orchestrates the murders of a mother and child as well as the execution of a man by stoning.²⁹

The two central couplets of *AP* 5.180, on Eros' genealogy, adapt an old topos in which hard-heartedness is explained by a fanciful birth or rearing. The earliest example comes from the *Iliad*, in a passage where Patroclus blames Achilles for abandoning the Greeks: 'The blue sea and steep rocks gave you birth, since your mind is harsh' (*Il.* 16.34–5). Theocritus later adapted this topos to Eros in *Idyll* 3.15–17, where a lovesick goatherd announces that now he has come to know the god, who was suckled by a lioness and reared in a thicket. In *Eclogues* 8 Vergil translates Theocritus' *νῦν ἔγνων τὸν Ἔρωτα*, 'Now I have come to know Eros' (*Id.* 3.15), with *nunc scio quid sit Amor*, 'Now I know what Amor is' (v. 43), a line that recalls the principal question in the *ἔρωτικοὶ λόγοι*, and then alludes as well to the Iliadic passage by naming the distant mountains and deserts as the birthplace of the boy-god. It is then that Damon identifies the god as *saevus Amor* (v. 47), who taught a mother (Medea?) to stain her hands with her children's blood. The translation of *δεινὸς Ἔρως* from *AP* 5.176, juxtaposed with the motif of Eros as a killer, found in *AP* 5.180 (and these two are the first and the last poems in the sequence), suggests that Hubaux was right to claim that this section of the *Garland* was one of Vergil's models for Damon's lament.³⁰ We should also notice that, while the topos of birth in the wild is elsewhere a form of reproach, in Meleager it ironically accompanies the lover's abandonment of his reproachful attitude. He now simply accepts that Eros' nature comes from his mother, her male associates, and her own mother, the Sea. These are the elements of the lover's destruction, as he abandons hope of delivery from the power of desire. The conclusion to the five-poem sequence is thus decidedly bleak, as love is identified with death itself.

The number of literary associations that can be brought to bear on Meleager's epigram sequence, both as precedents and as responses, is truly remarkable. In composing, or at least arranging, these five poems to serve as a

²⁸ Cf. Diosc. *AP* 12.37.2 = *HE* 10.2.

²⁹ Note also two epigrams from Philip's *Garland*, *Secund.* *AP* 214 = *GPh* 4 and *Phil.* *AP* 215 = *GPh* 74, in which the Erotes despoil the Olympian gods, taking even Ares' shield and helmet, and a poem from Agathias' *Cycle*, *Maced.* *AP* 5.238, where Eros holds a sword to show that even Ares yields to Aphrodite.

³⁰ Hubaux (1921), 159–60.

first-person perspective on the nature of erotic desire, Meleager reshaped earlier ideas about Eros as a cosmic and psychological force in order to create a lover's fantasy of controlling or abusing the god, and enclosed that fantasy in a frame that expresses despairing acceptance of love's power. Passages from Vergil, Propertius, and Ovid that draw on the sequence, as well as the reappearance of Meleager's motifs in imperial epigrams, show the significant role played by those five epigrams in the transformation of the earlier Greek analysis of the god into subjective accounts of pathetic lovers found in later literature.

Part 5

Praise and Blame

Mythological Burlesque and Satire in Greek Epigram—A Case Study

Zeus' Seduction of Danae

Maria Kanellou

1. INTRODUCTION

In the anonymous *AP* 9.48 = *FGE* 67, we read about some of Zeus' most well-known transformations: *Ζεὺς κύκνος, ταῦρος, σάτυρος, χρυσός, δι' ἔρωτα* | *Λήδης, Εὐρώπης, Ἀντιόπης, Δανάης* ('Zeus (turned into) a swan, a bull, a satyr, gold because of his desire for Leda, Europa, Antiope, Danae'). The distich hinges on the prepositional phrase *δι' ἔρωτα*, which offers the reason for the god's metamorphoses. Several epigrams of the *Greek Anthology* (mainly erotic ones) use and adapt Zeus' erotic adventures with women and with Ganymedes,¹ and the fact that these poems span a large swathe of antiquity—from Asclepiades up until Agathias' *Cycle*—makes them fertile ground for a diachronic examination of the reception of myths in the genre. In the present chapter, due to space considerations, I focus on the myth of Zeus' seduction of Danae and its reception in epigram.

I argue that two Hellenistic epigrams, Asclepiades *AP* 5.64 = *HE* 11 and Hedylus *HE* 8 = Athenaeus 8.344f–54a, burlesque the myth and point to the influence of mythological comedy on literary epigram during the first stages of its development. As we shall see, both poets employ mythological burlesque for skoptic purposes: Hedylus openly attacks Agis, who has an unstoppable crave for fish, and Asclepiades censures more tactfully the transformed Zeus. In Philip's *Garland* and in later epigrammatists, the burlesque of Danae's

¹ Epigrams using and revising myths about Zeus and his paramours constitute, of course, just a fraction of the total number of Greek literary epigrams that employ and adapt mythological stories.

seduction becomes a tool for humorous and satirical adaptations of the topics of prostitution and the power of gold and wealth in matters of love and for satirical attacks against the protagonists of the myth, Zeus and Danae, or against mortal targets, the prostitutes. The satire varies in tone, which can be milder or more caustic. As is argued here, these poems tell us something important about the generic nature of erotic epigram: attacks and jokes are to be found in the erotic domain. This amalgam of erotic and skoptic elements—attacks on a mortal or a divine target often using mythological burlesque to produce laughter—was cultivated until the sixth century CE, as an epigram composed by Paul the Silentiary shows.

By the end of this chapter it will be clear, I hope, why the lemmatist J wrote for the anonymous AP 9.48 *εἰς τὰς δι' ἀσέλγειαν μεταμορφώσεις τοῦ Διός* ('on Zeus' metamorphoses caused by his wantonness'). The lemmatist interpreted this short epideictic epigram as lampooning Zeus for his insatiable appetite for beautiful women through the lists of transformations and paramours that it offers. Indeed, such an interpretation is acceptable once one considers the life cycle and parody of the myth in the genre. So let us turn to the analysis of the chosen examples and look deeply into the adaptations of the myth of Danae's seduction by Zeus in the hands of epigrammatists.

2. DANAË'S SEDUCTION BY ZEUS IN GREEK EPIGRAMS

On the basis of the surviving material, Asclepiades AP 5.64 is the first literary epigram to employ the myth. In the poem, a man expresses his determination to continue his *komos* no matter how terrible the weather is. His desire to reach the beloved's house² is so overwhelming that it leads him to interpret the bad weather as an assault sent by Zeus, since Zeus is the one who controls the weather. In his emotional state, he tauntingly provokes Zeus to continue assailing him. As scholars have noted, the language echoes Prometheus' confrontational words in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* 1043–53 and emphasizes the man's defiance of the god.³ In contrast to Prometheus, though, the speaker recognizes the unbridgeable gap between himself and Zeus, since he

² The *komoi* could take place not only for female but also male beloveds (e.g. Asclep. AP 5.145 = HE 12; AP 5.167 = HE 14, which contains another invocation to Zeus and an ironic closure based on his erotic *pathemata*; Call. AP 12.118 = HE 8). Here the beloved's gender is not specified, since what matters is the projected emotion. For the motifs of the *komos* and the *paraklausithyron* in the genre, see Tarán (1979), 52–114; F. Cairns (2016), 353–66.

³ For Asclep. AP 5.64, cf. Gow and Page (1965), 2: 124; Guichard (2004), 223–30; Sens (2011), 67–76.

acknowledges that the god can stop his *komos* by killing him (v. 3).⁴ Moreover, the epigram draws on the motif of the *komos*, which featured prominently in New Comedy,⁵ and the comic subtext prepares the ground for the satirical twist at the end. A possible intertext is the opening scene of Menander's *Misoumenos* (vv. 9–14) with Thrasonides placing himself in the role of the *exclusus amator*,⁶ standing in the rainy and freezing dark night (circumstances similar to those of our epigram) outside his own house, soliloquizing, addressing the Night, and complaining about his current situation.⁷ In the last distich of *AP* 5.64, the speaker justifies his claim in verses 3–4 by offering an explanation that at the same time concludes his defiance against Zeus: Eros drags him, and this god is unbeatable, since even great Zeus fell victim to him in the past. The speaker creates a parallel between himself and the divine lover:

νεῖφε, χαλαζοβόλει, ποίει σκότος, αἶθε, κεραύνου,
 πάντα τὰ πορφύροντ' ἐν χθονὶ σείε νέφη·
 ἦν γάρ με κτείνης, τότε παύσομαι, ἦν δέ μ' ἀφῆς ζῆν
 καὶ διαθείς τούτων χείρονα, κωμάσομαι·
 ἔλκει γὰρ μ' ὁ κρατῶν καὶ σοῦ θεός, ᾧ ποτε πεισθείς,
 Ζεῦ, διὰ χαλκείων χρυσὸς ἔδυσ θαλάμων.
 (Asclep. *AP* 5.64 = *HE* 11)

Snow! Hail! Make it dark! Burn! Strike with lightning!
 Shake all the dark clouds onto the ground!
 Because if you kill me, then I shall stop; but if you let me live
 even after you do worse than these (to me), I shall sing a *komos*.
 For the god who governs even you, drags me; having obeyed him once,
 O Zeus, you slipped as gold into the brazen bedchamber.⁸

The irony against the god is evident; although he is now setting obstacles to the lover, his own actions have been dictated in the past by Eros. But why, out of all the transformations of the god, does Asclepiades choose this one? There must be a reason why he chooses this specific mythological exemplum and the projected parallelism. There is clearly an emphasis on the transformation,

⁴ Note the *homoeoteleuta* in vv. 3–4 that emphasize the antithesis between the two future scenarios (κτείνης/ἀφῆς and παύσομαι/κωμάσομαι).

⁵ The motif has its origin in archaic love poetry. Anagnostou-Laoutides (2015), 563 also recognizes *Misoumenos* as an intertext. For Asclepiades and New Comedy, see Sens (2011), xlv–xlvi.

⁶ For the motif in Roman elegy, see Copley (1956).

⁷ For Menander's influence on Asclepiades, see Handley (1996).

⁸ Text and translation from Sens (2011), 67. I adopt P's reading *διαθείς* in v. 4, following Jacobs (1826) and Beckby (1957–8) ad loc., who, in my view, rightly consider it to be a concessive participle. Other editors have preferred *διαθῆς* (Pl's reading). This structure is in tune with the speaker's humorous determination to pursue his *komos*; see Jacob's (1826) footnote on p. 128. The participle *διαδύς* in Paton (1916–18), 1: ad loc. conveys the same meaning. Despite its ingenuity, it is not supported by the mss and seems improbable, considering the use of *διὰ*... *ἔδυσ* in v. 6.

since χαλκείων is separated from θαλάμων in order to stress the contrast with χρυσός (hyperbaton), and the maiden is left unnamed (a sign of the popularity of the myth as well). Eros renders the speaker irrational and makes him walk through the storm and challenge Zeus. The mortal sarcastically reminds the god of the lengths to which the latter went in order to consummate his passion for Danae: he changed his form into gold.

The idea of comparing oneself to Zeus when it comes to matters of love dates back to Aristophanes' *Clouds* (1079–82), where the Worse Argument claims that Pheidippides can get away with adultery if he recalls the example of Zeus. Since Pheidippides is just a mortal, how could he be stronger than a god? (κάκεινος ὡς ἥττων Ἐρωτός⁹ ἐστι καὶ γυναικῶν | καίτοι σὺ θνητὸς ὦν θεοῦ πῶς μεῖζον ἂν δύναιο;, 'how even he [sc. Zeus] is overpowered by Eros and women; and yet, how could you, a mere mortal, have greater power than a god?', vv. 1081–2). While we cannot be sure whether the comic passage is an intertext, it helps us to perceive the comic tone at the closure of the epigram. In addition, δύομαι ('go into', 'plunge into')¹⁰ can allude to sex and penetration, and the sexual connotations stress the humour and irony of the last phrase Ζεῦ, διὰ χαλκείων χρυσὸς ἔδυσ θαλάμων (v. 6).¹¹ At one level, Zeus entered Danae's bedchamber in the form of drops of gold through its brazen walls (actually the roof, on the basis of the myth). At another level, the lover laughs at Zeus for transforming himself into gold to 'enter' the maiden. The comic subtext enables the appreciation of the specific transformation as a euphemism for bribery; Zeus turned into gold, in other words he offered Danae money, in order to have sex with her. The text subtly points to the power of gold, a concept that, as we shall see, is openly expressed in later epigrams. Additionally, if indeed χαλκείων χρυσός alludes to the unequal exchange of arms between Diomedes and Glaucus (*Il.* 6.235–6),¹² then it most probably adds to the criticism of Zeus for exchanging gold for sex. This 'reading' of the myth accentuates the burlesque and makes the man's sarcasm sharper. We should not forget, though, that there is a basic difference between the speaker and the god: Zeus was successful in his adventure, while we do not learn whether our lover even manages to reach the beloved's door.¹³ This gap between the man and Zeus gives the poem its serio-comic tone: on the one hand, the epigram stresses the exaggerated intensity of the man's passion, which makes him provoke and mock Zeus;¹⁴ on the other hand, it

⁹ I prefer to take the term as referring to Eros and not simply to the emotion.

¹⁰ *LSJ* s.v. δύω.

¹¹ One can compare Theoc. *Id.* 3.14, τὸν κισσὸν διαδύς ('having slipped through the ivy'), which has sexual connotations (see Hatzikosta 2005, 175). The same term is attested in Paul. Sil. AP 5.217, in the framework of the burlesque of Danae's seduction. See pp. 267–9.

¹² See Guichard (2004), 230; Sens (2011), 76. ¹³ See Sens (2011), 69 and 75–6.

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. Mel. AP 12.117 = HE 19, which stresses the irrationality of both the komast and Zeus—a state due to love.

pokes fun at the lover, who cannot perceive that his exaggerated emotionalism leads him to an invalid comparison: Zeus the shape-shifter always conquers the object of his desire, while this lover's fate remains unknown.¹⁵

This cynical adaptation of Zeus' seduction of Danae, presented as a meretricious affair, is prominent in Philip's *Garland*. In Asclepiades we have a first, more tactful, use of this approach, the poet preferring to play with keywords and concepts rather than making open statements (compare e.g. the clear-cut mockery in Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 5.31.5–6 = *GPh* 112.5–6).¹⁶ As has been suggested, this venal portrayal of Danae probably dates back to Euripides, given that *Danae* fragment 324 N (the speaker is most probably Acrisius) extols the power of gold as surpassing the pleasures of family life and as arousing a strong desire similar to Aphrodite's *golden* glance, the idea cynically implying that love is inspired by gold: ὦ χρυσέ, δεξίωμα κάλλιστον βροτοῖς, | ὡς οὔτε μήτηρ ἡδονὰς τοίας ἔχει, | οὐ παῖδες ἀνθρώποισιν, οὐ φίλος πατήρ, | οἷας σὺ χοῖ σέ δώμασιν κεκτημένοι. | εἰ δ' ἡ Κύπρις τοιοῦτον ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀρᾷ, | οὐ θαῦμ' ἔρωτας μυρίουσιν αὐτὴν τρέφειν ('O gold, you are the most beautiful possession of mortals, neither a mother nor children nor a dear father can bring to men the happiness you procure to the ones who have you in their houses. If Cypris stares with such a glance it is no wonder that she fuels countless passions').¹⁷ Menander's *Samia* 589–98 seems also to allude to such an adaptation of the story:

ΔΗΜ. οὐκ ἀκήκοας λεγόντων, εἰπέ μοι, Νικήρατε, 589
τῶν τραγωδῶν, ὡς γενόμενος χρυσὸς ὁ Ζεὺς ἐρρῦν
διὰ τέγους, καθειργμένην τὴν παῖδ' ἐμοίχευσέν ποτε;
ΝΙΚ. εἴτα δὴ τί τοῦτ'; *ΔΗΜ.* ἴσως δὲ πάντα προσδοκᾷ. σκόπει,
τοῦ τέγους εἴ σοι μέρος τι ῥεῖ. *ΝΙΚ.* τὸ πλείστον. ἀλλὰ τί
τοῦτο πρὸς ἐκεῖν' ἐστί; *ΔΗΜ.* τότε μὲν γίνεθ' ὁ Ζεὺς χρυσίον,
τότε δ' ὕδωρ. ὀρᾷς; ἐκείνου τοῦργον ἐστίν. ὡς ταχὺ 595
εὕρομεν. *ΝΙΚ.* καὶ βουκολεῖς με. *ΔΗΜ.* μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, ὅ γ' ἔγω μὲν οὐ.
ἀλλὰ χεῖρων οὐδὲ μικρὸν Ἀκρισίῳ δῆπουθεν εἰ.
εἰ δ' ἐκείνην ἤξιωσε, τὴν γε σὴν

(Men. *Sam.* 589–98)

D. Tell me, Niceratus, haven't you heard
the tragedians who tell that Zeus having turned into gold, flew
through the roof and seduced a secluded maiden?

N. Indeed, I have; so what? D. We must perhaps be prepared for everything. Think hard whether in your own roof there is an area that is leaking. N. Most of it is, but what does that have to do with this? D. Zeus sometimes becomes gold,

¹⁵ For the lamp epigrams as a good example of the serio-comic tone of several erotic epigrams, see Kanellou (2013).

¹⁶ See pp. 261–3.

¹⁷ For the fragment, see Karamanou (2006), 78–82, with further bibliography.

other times water. Do you see? This job is his! How quickly did we find the answer! N. You are making fun of me! D. By Apollo! No, not I. Not in the least are you worse than Acrisius, that's for sure! If he thought her worthy, then he certainly would your daughter.¹⁸

Just like in the epigram, the maiden's name is not mentioned, since the myth was popular—it is used here as a tragic exemplum¹⁹—and Menander wanted to put emphasis on Zeus' metamorphosis into gold. His transformation is used by Demeas as a medium for appeasing Niceratus, who has just found out that his unmarried daughter had been impregnated by Demeas' stepson and gave birth to his child.²⁰ The tragic exemplum is meant to act as an encoded message, and a parallel is created between the myth and the current situation. Plangon's illicit pregnancy is paralleled to Danae's secret impregnation and Demeas suggests that the drops of rain that fell from the leaky ceiling of Niceratus' house were actually Zeus in disguise, who impregnated Plangon. The idea is hilarious and the parody of the myth and Zeus is reinforced by the down-to-earth detail that the roof of Niceratus' house leaks badly.²¹ On the one hand, Demeas stresses Niceratus' poverty;²² on the other hand, his reference to golden Zeus, who has 'honoured' Niceratus' daughter just as he did Danae, hints at the solution to his neighbour's financial problems: Plangon's impregnation will bring him profit (through her marriage to his stepson).²³ The parody of Zeus becomes sharper if we take his metamorphosis into gold to imply that the god bribed Danae, an idea matching the financial implications of the text. As we shall see, the epigrammatists emphasized the mythological burlesque through a play on sounds and terms that denote gold and golden coins (see e.g. Antipater of Thessalonica AP 5.31.6). In the *Samia*, we have such a play between *γενόμενος χρυσὸς ὁ Ζεὺς* (v. 590) and *γίνεθ' ὁ Ζεὺς χρυσίον* (v. 594), as the latter term is often used to denote 'money';²⁴ definitely one is led to notice the repetition of terms and sounds. This is probably the reason why poor Niceratus, a typically comic figure, is said to be 'not in the least worse than king Acrisius' (v. 597). Niceratus will profit from his daughter's impregnation—while, as we know, Danae gave birth to Perseus, who killed Acrisius.

¹⁸ Translation from Papaioannou (2014), 106, adapted.

¹⁹ Cf. Hedylys *HE* 8; pp. 256–8. All the great tragedians handled the myth: Aeschylus did so in the (satyric) *Diktyoulkoi* (*Net Haulers*); Sophocles in his *Danae* (lost) and *Acrisius*; Euripides in his *Danae* and *Dictys*. See Hunter (1983), 114. For Zeus as a shower of gold, see e.g. *S. Ant.* 944–54; E. *Archel.* in *TrGF* fr. 228.9–10; Isoc. 10.59; Pi. *P.12.17–18*; *LIMC* III I.327 nos 1–7 (cited in Barsby 1999, 196); Pherecyd. *FGrHist* 3 F 10. For an extended list, see Karamanou (2006), 3–4 n. 9.

²⁰ See Gutzwiller (2000), 110–11.

²¹ See Konstantakos (2003–4), 45.

²² See Lamagna (1998), 593; Karamanou (2006), 57.

²³ Cf. Offermann (1978), 152–3; Karamanou (2006), 56–7.

²⁴ For *χρυσίον* in Menander, see Karamanou (2006), 56–7 with n. 185.

What matters most for us is that, by parodying Danae's seduction by Zeus, both Asclepiades and Menander continue the burlesque of Zeus' amours that flourished in the mythological comedies dating from the late fifth to the mid-fourth century BCE. As Ioannis Konstantakos points out, in mythological comedies either the traditional metamorphoses to which Zeus resorts to confront obstacles and fulfil his desire are exploited for comic effects (e.g. in Amphis' *Callisto* and Sannyrion's *Danae*) or, alternatively, Zeus adopts new schemes and plots that reduce him to the role of an ordinary adulterer in comic scenes (see e.g. the bell crater by Asteas that illustrates a scene from a comedy in which Zeus carries a ladder and is ready to climb up to the woman standing at the window, perhaps Alcmene or Danae; Hermes lights him on his way with a lamp).²⁵

Focusing on the myth of Danae's seduction, no less than three mythological comedies were composed with the title *Danae*—by Sannyrion, Apollophanes, and Eubulus—and some of them must have treated Zeus' erotic adventure with the maiden. Diphilus might have explored the topic in his *Chrysochoos*.²⁶ Noteworthy is Sannyrion's *Danae* fragment 8.1–2 K–A that parodies Zeus' metamorphosis into gold. The speaker (most probably Zeus) wonders what shape would be the best for him in order to sneak into a narrow hole of a roof. He thinks of turning into a weasel. Would that be a good idea? (τί οὖν γενόμενος εἰς ὀπήν ἐνδύσομαι; | ζητητέον· φέρ' εἰ γενοίμην < > γαλή·, 'What form should I take to get into the hole? Let's see. Suppose I turn into a weasel?').²⁷ The text also has sexual connotations in the idea of one 'entering a small hole'; ὀπή is a double entendre,²⁸ and we have detected such sexual allusions in Asclepiades AP 5.64. Unfortunately the fragments are so scanty (Apollophanes' *Danae* is lost) that we cannot talk about specific intertexts. However, as mentioned previously, AP 5.64, which parodies Zeus' transformation into gold, signifies the influence of mythological comedy on erotic epigram, already at the first stages of its development. Asclepiades' epigram is just one example from a subgroup of epigrams that span antiquity and burlesque Zeus' affairs and his metamorphoses for consummating his desires (see e.g. the epigrams humorously adapting Zeus' abduction of Ganymedes and other poems, discussed in this chapter, that parody and satirize his transformations for the sake of Danae, Leda, and Europa).²⁹ What is more, several of the epigrams that make fun of Zeus and Danae seem to adapt a technique of mythological comedy, that is, the portrayal of gods and mythical

²⁵ See Konstantakos (2002, 156–67; 2014, 173–4).

²⁶ See Hunter (1983), 114; Konstantakos (2002), 157.

²⁷ The fragment also satirizes the tragic actor Hegelochus; cf. Hunter (1983), 114; Konstantakos (2002), 161.

²⁸ J. Henderson (1991), 141.

²⁹ For the subgroup of epigrams employing Ganymedes, see Tarán (1979), 6–51; Sánchez Ortiz de Landaluce (2006).

heroes ‘as stereotypical figures of the comic stage’: for example in Ehippus’ *Busiris* fragment 2 K–A, Heracles is portrayed as a braggart soldier; in the *adespota* 1062.9–12 K–A, Apollo behaves as a moneylender and gets angry because he did not get his money back.³⁰ In some epigrams, the treatment of Zeus and Danae is similar: the princess resembles the hetaera, a typical figure of both comedy and epigram, as she accepts gold (golden coins, money) in exchange for sex, while Zeus resembles the client as he turns into gold, meaning that he gives money to have sex with her.³¹

Hedylus cleverly uses Danae’s seduction and Zeus’ metamorphosis in *HE* 8;³² the parody of the myth and Danae’s beauty becomes a satirical tool against the *ὀψοφάγος*³³ Agis, who is so resourceful in gaining access to food that the speaker is afraid lest he find a way to get at a tasty boiled beauty-fish:

ἐφθός ὁ κάλλιχθυσ· νῦν ἔμβαλε τὴν βαλανάγραν
 ἔλθῃ μὴ Πρωτεὺς Ἄγισ ὁ τῶν λοπάδων·
 γίνεθ’ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὃ βούλεται· ἀλλ’ ἀπόκλειε

.....

ᾗξει γὰρ τοιαῦτα μεταπλασθεὶς τυχὸν ὡς Ζεὺς
 χρυσορόης ἐπὶ τήνδ’ Ἀκρισίου λοπάδα.

(Hedyl. *HE* 8 = Ath. 8.344f–54a)

5

Boiled is the beauty-fish; now throw the bolt
 lest Agis, that Proteus of dishes, comes.
 He changes into water and fire and anything else he wants. So shut him out

 For maybe, changed into a stream of gold like Zeus,
 he will get at this dish of Acrisius.³⁴

That Asclepiades *AP* 5.64 was one of Hedylus’ models is evidenced by the similarities between the two poems: both of them employ the same mythological exemplum in the last distich and the mythological burlesque is coupled with sarcasm against Zeus and Agis, respectively; neither of them mentions Danae by name and Zeus’ metamorphosis is emphasized: the position of *χρυσός* in *AP* 5.64.6 has already been noted, while *χρυσορόης* emphatically opens the last verse of Hedylus’ epigram.

Despite the fragmentary state of the poem, its wittiness is apparent. Agis’ (alleged) shape-shifting ability definitely stresses his relentless ingenuity and

³⁰ For the technique, the examples used here and others, see Konstantakos (2014), 171–5 (quotation at 171).

³¹ See Asclep. *AP* 5.64, Antip. Thess. *AP* 5.31, Parmen. *AP* 5.33 and 5.34, Strat. *AP* 12.239, and Pall. *AP* 5.257.

³² For Hedylus’ epigrams, see e.g. Fraser (1972), 1: 572 (on their skoptic tone); Galli Calderini (1983; 1984).

³³ ‘One who eats delicacies such as fish’; see *LSJ* s.v. *ὀψοφάγος*.

³⁴ For the epigrams, I have used the editions of Gow and Page (1965; 1968). The translations are my own, but I have consulted Paton’s (1816–18) translations.

cleverness in accessing food.³⁵ However, it is his (hypothetical) transformation into gold that makes the speaker feel particularly anxious (note the γάρ); the speaker fears that Agis may turn into gold—meaning, at a literal level, that if he offers a bribe he will get the dish, just as Zeus once ‘got’ Danae by similar means; precautions may therefore prove ineffective. The humorous concept stems from analogies between the mythological exemplum and the current situation: Zeus turned into gold to penetrate a secured location, and the speaker is afraid lest Agis attempt to enter a locked room; in each case, what one desires is protected and locked away. In fact, throughout the poem, Hedylus creates a line of associations between the mythological exemplum and the situation at hand. The speaker orders for the dish to be locked in a room (ἐμβαλε τὴν βαλανάγραν, v. 1) so that Agis has no access (ἀπόκλειε, v. 3). Hedylus also cleverly connects Danae with the dish that Agis desires: the fish is said to be a κάλλιχθυσ, and this choice of noun is not accidental. In the last verse, the dish is openly described with the genitive of possession appropriate for Danae (Ἀκρισίου, v. 6), and it becomes perceptible that κάλλιχθυσ is a hilariously witty pun alluding to Danae’s beauty. It probably subverts her epic description as καλλίσφυρος at *Iliad* 14.319, where Zeus himself refers to her charms (οὐδ’ ὅτε περ Δανάης καλλίσφύρου Ἀκρισιώνης, ‘not for fair-ankled Danae, Acrisius’ daughter’).³⁶ In the *Iliad*, Danae’s beauty is mentioned together with her father’s name, just as in our epigram where the dish is first emphatically described as a beauty-fish (v. 1) and then as ‘Acrisius’ dish’ (v. 6). The ring composition is based on the very amusing association of Danae with the fish. In addition, since hetaerae in antiquity had names denoting fish, the parallelism between Danae and the beauty-fish can allude to the idea that she slept with Zeus after he offered gold to her.³⁷ In this case, the burlesque would be sharper and the epigram would attack both Agis (openly) and Zeus and Danae (more tactfully).

What is more, Agis is humorously described as the Πρωτεύς...ὁ τῶν λοπάδων (v. 2). This portrayal of him is closely linked to the final phrase Ἀκρισίου λοπάδα, which brings together the two mythical exempla to further justify the speaker’s fear and precaution; since Agis is the ‘Proteus of dishes’,

³⁵ See Gutzwiller (1998), 173.

³⁶ The adjective is also attributed to Danae in ‘Hes.’ fr. 129.14 M–W; cf. Pi. N. 10.10–11, where Argos’ long-standing excellence in producing women with beautiful hair (καλλικόμοισιν) is said to have been confirmed by Zeus himself, who visited Alcmena and Danae. In ‘Hes.’ fr. 135 M–W, we have the earliest reference to golden Zeus in the framework of the myth: ἀ]νέτειλε Διὶ χρυσεῖ [‘rose up for golden Zeus’].

³⁷ For prostitutes’ names related to fish, see McClure (2003), 72–3 and 55, 67; for the connection of hetaerae with food, see Davidson (1997), 3–35 and 63–4; in relation to the epigram, see Gutzwiller (1998), 174 n. 118. For Danae as the name of a hetaera, see Ath. 593b–d with McClure (2003), 156–7.

he can get at ‘Acrisius’ dish’.³⁸ Agis’ (alleged) ability to change into water, fire, and anything else he wants (v. 3), which explains his characterization as ‘Proteus’, reveals *Odyssey* 4.417–18 as an intertext: there it is stressed that the sea god ‘will attempt to turn into any creature that crawls on earth, as well as into water and portentous fire’ (πάντα δὲ γιγνόμενος πειρήσεται, ὅσσ’ ἐπὶ γαίαν | ἐρπετὰ γίγνονται, καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ θεσπιδαῖς πῦρ).³⁹ Verb forms of γίγνομαι and Proteus’ transformations into water and fire are used in both the *Odyssey* and the epigram (note that water and fire are found in the same word order and linked with καί). Hedylus inverts the structure of the Homeric excerpt and begins with more specific transformations, to conclude with the general statement that Agis takes any shape he desires. The element of water links Proteus, the beauty-fish, and Zeus, who can easily turn into water (cf. e.g. Men. *Sam.* 595). If the missing pentameter included another shape-shifter related to the sea, Nereus would be the appropriate match for Proteus: they were both sea gods and could take all forms, including those of water and fire.⁴⁰

On the whole, Hedylus reinvestigates the burlesque of Danae’s seduction as he employs it for the humorous invective against Agis, combining Zeus with another trickster (perhaps tricksters) and mixing and adapting material from epic poetry.⁴¹ Both Hellenistic epigrams, *AP* 5.64 and Hedylus *HE* 8, use burlesque as the means for mockery—against Zeus and Agis respectively—and in this sense they are forerunners of later skoptic imperial epigram, which turned (mainly) to attacks against types of people and professions. There survive skoptic imperial epigrams that use mythological burlesque as a tool for ridiculing targets, just as the two Hellenistic epigrams. These two poems confirm that such attacks are to be found in the genre already in the Hellenistic period, although relevant epigrams were not categorized as skoptic: Hedylus *HE* 8 is preserved in Athenaeus, not in the *Greek Anthology*, and Asclepiades *AP* 5.64 was classified as erotic owing to the strong presence in it of erotic motifs.⁴²

³⁸ Another point of contact between the first and the last distich that intensifies the ring composition.

³⁹ Cf. *Od.* 4.455–8, where Proteus takes several shapes and amid all forms becomes ὕγρον ὕδωρ (‘running water’).

⁴⁰ For Nereus, see Pherecyd. *FGrHist* 3 F 16a (μεταμορφούμενον εἰς ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ, ‘changing into water and fire’); Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.11 (καὶ παντοίας ἐναλλάσσοντα μορφάς, ‘and transforming into all possible shapes’).

⁴¹ An epigram preserved in *P. Oxy.* LXVI 4502 (attributed to Nicarchus) employs the phrase ὀψοφάγῳ λοπάδα (v. 42 of the papyrus) as one of the examples that stress the idea that, if one’s wife is near Damon, he will definitely seduce her, just as an *opsophagos* will surely eat fine dishes if they are entrusted to him. I believe that the use of λοπάδα at the end of the verse suggests Hedylus as the model. For the papyrus, see Morelli (2015).

⁴² The recently published Vienna Epigrams Papyrus (*G* 40611) shows that topics considered in the past to be the product of imperial skoptic epigram already existed in the Hellenistic era. See the introduction to this volume (Chapter 1), pp. 5, 7, and 12, with bibliography.

A characteristic case study of an imperial skoptic epigram employing mythological burlesque is Nicarchus *AP* 11.328, which satirizes an old prostitute. The parody of the mythological division of earth (see *Il.* 15.189–93) is employed to degrade a *porne* and to describe group sex between her and three men: the customers cast lots for her orifices and are confined to whatever they draw, which parodies the distribution of the world among Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades by lot.⁴³ Lucillius *AP* 11.88 and Nicarchus *AP* 11.407 are also good examples, since they employ Zeus' abduction of Ganymedes as a tool for humorously exploring the topic of 'small and thin people'.⁴⁴ In *AP* 11.88, Eroticon is (supposedly) carried off by a gnat, and this makes her believe that Zeus desires her; the erotic connotations of the epigram are obvious already in the girl's name.⁴⁵ Nicarchus *AP* 11.407, like Hedylus *HE* 8, parodies Zeus' love adventure in order to ridicule a target that has nothing to do with the domain of love; the fly that (supposedly) takes away lean Menestratus is compared to the eagle that carried Ganymedes to Olympus.⁴⁶

Both epigrams develop a comic strand in the genre that dates back to the Hellenistic era: the burlesque of the myth of Ganymedes and satire of Zeus' fondness for boys (see e.g. Dioscorides *AP* 12.37 = *HE* 10, Meleager *AP* 12.65 = *HE* 100, and the anonymous *AP* 12.69 = *HE* 21). These epigrams are essentially erotic-skoptic. It is their inclusion in Book 11 or, alternatively, Book 12, that stresses their skoptic (Lucillius, Nicarchus) or erotic side (the Hellenistic poets).⁴⁷ Interesting is also Leonidas of Alexandria *AP* 12.20 = *FGE* 39,⁴⁸ where the speaker guesses that Zeus must be busy elsewhere or else he would have snatched Periander like Ganymedes. One of his hypotheses is that golden Zeus 'has crept into Danae's bedchamber' (ἡ χρυσὸς Δανάης εἴρπυσεν εἰς θαλάμους, v. 2). Whether or not we accept that gold is here a euphemism for bribery, the secrecy of the love affair is stressed, and the epigram (just as *AP* 11.88) makes fun of Zeus and his fondness for both women and young boys through mythological burlesque.⁴⁹

The melange of the erotic and satirical element can also be found in Philip's *Garland* and in later epigrams (see the examples from Palladas and Paul the Silentiary in this chapter).⁵⁰ The poems that will be analysed exemplify that

⁴³ See Blomqvist (1998) for other examples of Hellenistic epigrams with a strong satirical side.

⁴⁴ Cf. Nicarch. *AP* 11.330. For Nicarchus' epigrams, see Schatzmann (2012).

⁴⁵ For the epigram, see Floridi (2014a), 168–73. *AP* 11.88 is one of the Lucillian models that Nicarchus amalgamates in *AP* 11.407 (see Floridi 2014a, 84 and 193).

⁴⁶ Cf. Nicarch. *AP* 11.330.4–5, another epigram that burlesques the abduction of Ganymedes.

⁴⁷ Compare Strato who also composed homoerotic epigrams with a skoptic tone; see Floridi (2007), 22–4.

⁴⁸ For the ascription, see Page (1981), 510–12 and 539.

⁴⁹ Cf. the erotic-skoptic anon. *AP* 5.65, in which the abduction of Ganymedes and Zeus' affair with Leda are used as mythological exempla in favour of a man's sexual appetite for both sexes.

⁵⁰ Cf. Strat. *AP* 12.239 and the material in nn. 31 and 67 in this chapter. Satirical attacks against hetaerae are to be found in other subgenres as well; see e.g. the dedicatory anon.

the use of mythological burlesque to generate or enable mockery survived in the genre from the Hellenistic period to the sixth century CE. In Philip's *Garland*, the myth is employed in epigrams that were categorized as erotic by the Byzantine collectors. These poems, however, also have a clear skoptic side, more acerbic by comparison to AP 5.64, since they explore the topic of paid-for sex (Antipater of Thessalonica AP 5.31 = *GPh* 112, Parmenion AP 5.33 = *GPh* 1 and AP 5.34 = *GPh* 2, and Bassus AP 5.125 = *GPh* 1). They continue the comic treatment of the myth in the genre, and offer the first clear-cut portrayal in surviving Greek literature of a venal Danae who accepted gold to sleep with Zeus.⁵¹ Prostitution is a common topic in erotic epigram, and these poems constitute adaptations of the attacks on hetaerae on the grounds of payment; in such epigrams gold is used as the fee of *megalomisthōi* hetaerae. For instance, in the anonymous AP 5.2.1–2, the financially deprived speaker attacks Sthenelais because he can enjoy her charms only in his sleep: *τὴν καταφλέξιπολιν Σθενελαΐδα, τὴν βαρύμισθον, | τὴν τοῖς βουλομένοις χρυσὸν ἐρευγομένην* ('Sthenelais who sets the city on fire, the highly paid one, who belches out gold because of the ones who desire her'). The pointed mockery is directed at the hetaera's financial profit and the hyperbole accentuates the sarcasm; she has (metaphorically) filled her stomach with so much gold that she spews it out.⁵² Satire of prostitutes in similar terms is found in the skoptic subgenre. Characteristic is the anonymous AP 11.416: *χρήματα καὶ πόρναις παραγίνεται οὐκ ἀλεγίζω. | μισεῖτω με τάλας χρυσὸς ὁ πορνοφίλας* ('Money comes into the hands of prostitutes too. I care not. Let wretched gold that loves prostitutes hate me'). These epigrams suggest that there were no unbridgeable borders between the two subgenres, but rather cross-fertilization. In Rufinus AP 5.27, old age humbles the hetaera Melissa, who used to be 'golden' (vv. 1, 4), the epithet stressing her bygone beauty and wealth; the hetaera is mocked, and again the erotic and skoptic element coexist. It is anthologization that shows the reader which feature of such epigrams the compiler considered to be more prominent.

AP 6.283 = HE 39, where the speaker lampoons an aged hetaera. There are also several erotic epigrams where the lover turns against the beloved—often a hetaera—and mocks her. Such Hellenistic epigrams point to the epigrammatic seeds that formed the basis of later skoptic epigrams directed at aged prostitutes, such as Nicarch. AP 11.71 and 11.73.

⁵¹ Danae's seduction by Zeus was also widely used and adapted by Roman poets, see e.g. Prop. 2.20.9–12; Ov. *Am.* 2.19.27–8; 3.4.21–2, 3.8.29–34; Ov. *Met.* 4.610–11 and 697–8, 5.250, 6.113, 11.116–17; Hor. *Carm.* 3.16.1–11; Ter. *Eun.* 583–93. For the impact of Hellenistic Greek epigram on Latin erotic elegy, see Keith (2011).

⁵² For the use of gold in epigrams that explore the motif of prostitution (often in a satirical tone, as many such epigrams draw on comedy), see e.g. the anon. AP 5.101 = *FGE* 6, where a man is rejected because the money (*χρυσίον*) he offers is not enough, and the anon. AP 6.283 = HE 39, where the speaker laughs at an aged hetaera who used to boast of her wealthy lovers (*πολυχρύσοις*... *ἐρασταῖς*, v. 1). For Noss. AP 9.332 = HE 4, where the hetaera Polyarchis devotes a golden statue to Aphrodite, see Kanellou (2016), 192–5.

I open the discussion of the relevant material from Philip's *Garland* with Antipater of Thessalonica AP 5.31, the most interesting and elaborate epigram of the subgroup. The poem combines two different myths: it opens with an emphatic allusion to the myth of the metallic races, first attested in Greek literature in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (109–201),⁵³ and concludes with the cynical rationalization of Zeus' seduction of Danae. In contrast to the Hellenistic epigrams already analysed, Danae is mentioned by name as the focus turns to her venality, since this is a poem about prostitution:⁵⁴

χρῦσεος ἦν γενεὴ καὶ χάλκεος ἀργυρέη τε
 πρόσθεν· παντοίη δ' ἡ Κυθήρεια τὰ νῦν,
 καὶ χρυσοῦν τίει καὶ χάλκεον ἄνδρ' ἐφίλησεν
 καὶ τοὺς ἀργυρέους οὐποτ' ἀποστρέφεται.
 Νέστωρ ἢ Παφίη· δοκέω δ' ὅτι καὶ Δανάη Ζεὺς
 οὐ χρυσός, χρυσοῦς δ' ἦλθε φέρων ἑκατόν.
 (Antip. Thess. AP 5.31 = GPh 112)

5

There was the golden, the brazen, and the silver age
 in the past; but now Cytherea is of all sorts.
 She honours the man of gold and she loves the brazen man
 and she never turns her back on silver men.
 Paphia is a very Nestor. I think that even Zeus came to Danae,
 not as gold, but with a hundred golden coins.

Antipater of Thessalonica cleverly blends together the concepts of golden Aphrodite, the golden age of the human race, and Zeus' metamorphosis into gold. Aphrodite, the patroness of hetaerae, is constantly described as golden from Homer onwards,⁵⁵ and in Antipater AP 5.30 = GPh 6 the speaker humorously argues that the epic poet rightly attributed the epithet to Aphrodite since one cannot have sex if one does not pay. In AP 5.31, Antipater expands on this idea, as Aphrodite is not just golden but also brazen and silver.

The adjective 'golden' joins together the two myths and makes easy the transition from the golden race of men to the golden client and then golden Zeus and the allegation that he paid 100 golden coins to have sex with Danae. Zeus himself—the greatest of lovers—becomes here one of those golden

⁵³ For the reception of the myth of the metallic races, see Van Noorden (2015). For the reception of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, see Hunter (2014).

⁵⁴ Cf. Parmen. AP 5.33 and 5.34.

⁵⁵ See e.g. *Od.* 4.14, 8.337, 8.342, 17.37, and 19.54; *Il.* 3.64, 5.427, 9.389, 19.282, 22.470, and 24.699; *Mimn.* fr. 1 W (the elegy opens with the concept of 'golden Aphrodite' and, as in our epigram, an explanation is offered; the adjective concretizes the charms of youth, meaning clandestine loves, gentle gifts, and bed, vv. 3–4; the fragment might have been one of Antipater's models); Thgn. 1381–5; Theoc. *Id.* 15.101 (with H. White 1981, 192–4: the verse points to Aphrodite Pandemus). For the characterization of Aphrodite as 'golden', see Friedrich (1978), 77–9. For the motif of praising a woman through her comparison or assimilation to Aphrodite, see Kanellou (2016).

clients; the mythological burlesque is heightened. As already mentioned, the poem opens with the allusion to the myth of the metallic races through the use of specific keywords. Cytherea, used here metonymically for sex and prostitution, suits the Hesiodic allusion, since the name is attested in *Theogony* 192–6. While in Hesiod the three metallic adjectives symbolize the fall of humankind, in *AP* 5.31 they express a decrease in the fee that one can pay for sex and different financial status. The point becomes clear in the next distich, where Antipater states that Cytherea makes no discrimination; everyone is welcome.⁵⁶ She is παντοίη ('of all sorts, manifold, of all possible shapes').⁵⁷ The term, apart from expanding the deity's standard characterization as 'golden', even hints at shape-shifting. In this sense, it matches the use in the epigram of the shape-shifter Zeus and can even allude to the readiness of a prostitute to perform any sex act if the price is right. The use of τίει in verse 3 is humorous and almost sarcastic. While it normally expresses reverence towards the gods, here it is attributed to Cytherea in order to emphasize the eagerness with which prostitutes welcome wealthy clients; the customer is assessed in financial terms, since τίω also means 'value, rate'.⁵⁸

Noteworthy is also the absence of a linear decline in the usage of the metallic epithets, and this is intentional: the golden race is followed first by the brazen and then by the silver one, and the sequence corresponds to the customers' classification (vv. 3–4). The irregularity has a double aim, as it projects the adjective 'brazen' and creates an intense contrast between the golden and the brazen age and, correspondingly, the golden and the brazen client—a contrast highlighted through the repetition of sounds in the words: the anaphora of -εος in χρύσεος and χάλκεος (v. 1), the consonance of -ν in χρυσοῦν and χάλκεον (v. 3), and the repetition of χ- in all these terms. The antithesis underscores the fact that Cytherea serves all customers, and this means (at a literal level) that there are prostitutes to suit every pocket. In addition, let us not forget that Danae was imprisoned by Acrisius in a brazen chamber⁵⁹ and the use of brass in the first verse creates another indirect link between the two myths. Antipater also emphatically states that 'Paphia is a very Nestor' (v. 5). Nestor's long life (*Il.* 1.250–2,⁶⁰ *Od.* 3.244–6) enables his metaphorical association with Aphrodite, which underlines that prostitution is an old profession; the idea, of course, is introduced by the myth of the races (the golden race is the oldest one). Additionally, the phrase can allude to Nestor's wisdom, which is combined with the longevity of his kingship at *Odyssey* 3.244–6, and so we

⁵⁶ Cf. Gow and Page (1968), 2: 108.

⁵⁷ *LSJ* s.v. παντοῖος.

⁵⁸ *LSJ* s.v. τίω.

⁵⁹ Cf. e.g. Pherecyd. *FGrHist* 3 F10; Asclep. *AP* 5.64.6.

⁶⁰ Cf. Gow and Page (1968), 2: 108.

can have another interrelated, witty, and humorous idea: Aphrodite has been wise enough not to reject any type of client.⁶¹

The pointed joke on Danae is based on the cynical rationalization of the mythological exemplum (see *δοκέω*, v. 5): Zeus did not transform himself into gold, but he brought Danae 100 golden coins to have sex with her.⁶² The implication is that even maidens submit to the power of gold and, as in verse 4, the placement of *χρυσός* and *χρυσοῦς* next to each other and the repetition of sounds underscore the cynicism. Antipater exploits the concept also in *AP* 9.420.3 = *GPh* 51.3, where Telembrotus, a man in emotional pain, is advised that *χρυσὸς Ἔρωτος ἀεὶ παιώνιος* ('Gold is always the remedy for E/eros'). Weeping and adopting a passive stance will gain him nothing. Gold is the key to winning in matters of love (the assonance of -os stresses the strong bond between gold and love).

Parmenion composed two interrelated epigrams on the topic, both of them laconic, skoptic in tone, and highly cynical as far as the mythological burlesque is concerned:

ἐς Δανάην ἔρρευσας, Ὀλύμπιε, χρυσός, ὣν' ἡ παῖς
ὥς δώρω πεισθῇ, μὴ τρέσῃ ὡς Κρονίδην.
(Parmen. *AP* 5.33 = *GPh* 1)

You flew like gold rain to Danae, Olympian, so that the girl
would be won over by the gift, and not tremble before Cronos' son.

ὁ Ζεὺς τὴν Δανάην χρυσοῦ, κἀγὼ δὲ σε χρυσοῦ·
πλείονα γὰρ δοῦναι τοῦ Διὸς οὐ δύναμαι.
(Parmen. *AP* 5.34 = *GPh* 2)

Zeus (had) Danae for a golden coin, and I (shall have) you for a golden coin;
for I cannot give more than Zeus.

In the first epigram, *πεισθῇ* (v. 2) takes us back to *AP* 5.64 (*ᾧ ποτε πεισθείς*, v. 5) and suggests that Parmenion adapts Asclepiades: the verb is transferred from the god to the maiden in order to highlight that she willingly gave herself to the god because of the gold that she received.⁶³ *ἔρρευσας* (v. 1) expresses the transformation of Zeus into a stream of gold (cf. *χρυσορόης* in Hedylus *HE* 8) and acts as a double entendre, since the notion of 'flowing to/into

⁶¹ It should be noted that Nestor and Aphrodite are mentioned together for the first time on the famous 'Cup of Nestor' (*CEG* 455). This suggests that Antipater might be reworking here an earlier motif whose traces are now lost.

⁶² The juxtaposition of *χρυσός* and *χρυσοῦς*, together with the alliteration of consonants, echoes the play on words at *AP* 5.64.6 (*χαλκείων χρυσός*). In both epigrams, the myth is emphatically used in the last distich, and the similarities show that Antipater adapts Asclepiades.

⁶³ For gold and money as the medium for winning in matters of love, see e.g. Antip. Thess. *AP* 9.420, where *πείθω* is also employed: *μὴ κλαίων τὸν Ἔρωτα δόκει, Τηλέμβροτε, πείσειν* ('do not think that you will persuade Eros by weeping, Telembrotus', v. 1); also Antip. Thess. *AP* 9.241.4 = *GPh* 52.4 with Gow and Page (1968), 2: 62–3.

Danae' can allude to penetration.⁶⁴ The verbal form *μὴ τρέσῃ* (v. 2) stresses Zeus' terrifying strength⁶⁵ and most likely refashions a specific strand in the treatment of the maiden's sexual experience in mythological comedy: the girl was forced to have sex. Although, due to the scanty fragments, no specific intertext can be detected, in Eubulus' *Danae* fragment 22 K–A it is most probably Danae who complains, after her rape, of Zeus' merciless brutality (*ὅς με κλάουσαν τότε | οὐκ ἠλέησεν*, 'who did not show mercy to me when I was crying').⁶⁶ The epigrammatist argues, with brutal sarcasm, that gold secured the girl's willing submission.

AP 5.33 is centred on the myth and its sarcastic burlesque. In AP 5.34, the story works as a mythological exemplum and the burlesque is, again, derisive; since Zeus gave Danae a golden coin, the speaker cannot offer a higher fee to his interlocutor, obviously a hetaera.⁶⁷ The witticism hinges on *χρυσοῦ* (genitive of price), which can be either the genitive of *χρυσός* ('gold') or that of *χρυσοῦς* ('a golden coin').⁶⁸ Since the speaker aims to create an analogy between himself and Zeus, the sarcasm is sharper if we take the ambiguous *χρυσοῦ* to stand for a golden coin. As in earlier epigrams, there is a clever play with words and sounds. The repetition of *χρυσοῦ* (v. 1) and Zeus (*Ζεὺς* and *Διός*) in conjunction with the alliteration of δ- in *δοῦναι* and *οὐ δύναμαι* (v. 2) underlines in ironic tone the commerciality of Danae's body and the speaker's determination not to offer a higher price to the hetaera (a similar effect is achieved in AP 5.33.2 through the repetition of *ὥς* and the assonance in *πεισθῇ* and *τρέσῃ*, which emphasize Danae's venal portrayal).

Bassus AP 5.125 exemplifies in its turn the continuous search for originality in the reception of motifs and myths within the tightly limited length of the genre. The speaker subverts the mythological exemplum; he does not align himself with Zeus⁶⁹ but, on the contrary, declares that he will not resort to tricks and plots:

οὐ μέλλω ρεύσειν χρυσός ποτε· βούς δὲ γένοιτο
ἄλλος χὼ μελίθρους κύκνος ἐπηγόنيος.

Ζηνὶ φυλασσέσθω τάδε παίγνια· τῇ δὲ Κορίννῃ
τοὺς ὀβολοὺς δώσω τοὺς δύο, κοῦ πέτομαι.

(Bass. AP 5.125 = GPh 1)

⁶⁴ Cf. Asclep. AP 5.64; Paul. Sil. AP 5.217.2.

⁶⁵ Note that one can never encounter Zeus in his true form, as Semele did to her cost (see e.g. Pi. O. 2.25–6, D.S. 4.2.1, 5.52.1, Ps. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.26–7, Philostr. *Im.* 1.14).

⁶⁶ For the fragment, see Hunter (1983), 214–15; Konstantakos (2002), 161. Cf. Antip. Thess. AP 9.241.4, *ἐστέ γὰρ οὐ πειθοῦς εὐνέται ἀλλὰ βίης* ('you were mates not by persuasion but by force'); the poem satirizes mythical lovers, including Zeus, and the transformations to which they resorted to consummate their desire.

⁶⁷ For such a bargain where Danae's myth is employed, see Strat. AP 12.239 with Floridi (2007), 358–64.

⁶⁸ Cf. Antip. Thess. AP 5.31.6 *οὐ χρυσός, χρυσοῦς*.

⁶⁹ This is also the case in Antip. Thess. AP 9.241; see notes 63 and 66 in this chapter.

I am never going to flow like a stream of gold; let someone else become a bull,
or the melodious swan on the shore.
Let Zeus cherish these games; instead to Corinna
I shall give my two obols, and I am not flying.

The epigram clearly reworks the topos of the availability of prostitutes for a low fee and at the same time continues the comic treatment of Zeus' transformations. Bassus does not give the names of the god's paramours since the myths were well known and the reader could easily grasp the allusions through keywords to Danae (gold), Europa (bull), and Leda (swan),⁷⁰ while *πέτομαι* (v. 4) can refer back to Zeus' metamorphosis into a swan or allude to Ganymedes, whom Zeus abducted in the form of an eagle; this would be a nice touch as the poem would then bring together the god's heterosexual and homosexual affairs. More importantly, the vocabulary employed turns the focus to Zeus' *παίγνια* (v. 3). This technique of bringing forth, isolating, and emphasizing specific aspects of a myth through carefully selected keywords is attested in Asclepiades AP 5.64 and other epigrams, as we have noted. *Παίγνια* is, of course, a double entendre, since it easily alludes to Zeus' 'playfulness', both his metamorphoses and his love affairs, in a dismissive manner.⁷¹

For my present purposes, I narrow the analysis to the adaptation of Danae's myth. A special tie exists between Bassus' epigram and Parmenion's epigrammatic pair: AP 5.125 and 5.34 employ types of *δίδωμι* in the same metrical position (*δοῦναι* in AP 5.34.2 and *δώσω* in AP 5.125.4); in both AP 5.125.4 and 5.34.2 (i.e. in their last verse) we have the alliteration of δ- (*δοῦναι*... *δύναμαι* in AP 5.34.2 and *δώσω*... *δύο* in AP 5.125.4), which emphasizes the financial transaction and the exchange of sex for money. In addition, *ρεύσειν χρυσός* (AP 5.125.1) closely echoes *ῥευσσας*... *χρυσός* (AP 5.33.1), and both phrases are placed in the opening dactylic hexameter. The similarities suggest that Bassus amalgamated Parmenion's epigrams (although the reverse adaptation cannot be excluded).

The metamorphosis into gold is the first one to be mentioned. The god is mocked for having transformed himself in order to consummate his yearning, and the speaker believes these tricks to be superfluous and unnecessary, since one can have sex with a prostitute for a low fee. The first phrase of the poem is a euphemism for payment (especially given the epigrammatic background that portrayed a Danae of loose ethics), and a nice ring composition is created, as the poem opens and closes with a play on paid-for sex. Zeus is compared with the speaker, and the following antithesis is stressed: the man will never 'flow

⁷⁰ Zeus turned into a swan for Nemesis as well (see e.g. Isoc. 10.59). But Leda is a stronger candidate.

⁷¹ For *paizein* as euphemism for having sex, see J. Henderson (1991), 157. For a humorous allusion to Zeus' erotic affairs (his *παίγνια*) in *Il.* 14.312–29, see Mel. AP 5.197 = *HE* 23 with Kanellou (2013), 281–3.

like a stream of gold', that is, he will never pay a high fee for sex, since he can have Corinna for just two obols. The epigram is in line with Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 5.31 and echoes Asclepiades *AP* 5.64, where the speaker acerbically addresses Zeus and uses his metamorphosis to illustrate that the god expended efforts to satisfy his passion. Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 5.109 = *GPh* 53 is another instance of such a use of mythological burlesque—the speaker subverts Zeus' metamorphosis into a bull—to underline the power of money in the sphere of love. After stressing at length the availability of a prostitute called Europa, whom one can have for a drachma, the speaker pities and pokes fun at Zeus for having transformed himself in order to consummate his desire for his own Europa, the Phoenician princess: ἦ ῥα μάτην, Ζεῦ φίλε, βοῦς ἐγένου ('in truth without reason, dear Zeus, you turned into a bull', v. 4). Uncomplicated and reasonably priced paid-for sex is favoured.

In *AP* 5.257, the late antique epigrammatist Palladas of Alexandria remodels the burlesque of Zeus' seduction of Danae in the genre.⁷² The parody of the myth and of other erotic adventures of the god (with Europa and Leda, see Antipater and Bassus earlier in this chapter) also forms a tool for treating comically the topic of prostitution; this is another erotic-skoptic epigram.⁷³ The parody is very sharp, the god being presented as the defendant in a hilarious mini-trial in which the speaker adopts the role of the prosecutor:

νῦν καταγινώσκω καὶ τοῦ Διὸς ὡς ἀνεράστου,
 μὴ μεταβαλλομένου τῆς σοβαρᾶς ἔνεκα·
 οὔτε γὰρ Εὐρώπης, οὐ τῆς Δανάης περὶ κάλλος,
 οὔθ' ἀπαλῆς Λήδης ἔστ' ἀπολειπομένη·
 εἰ μὴ τὰς πόρνas παραπέμπεται· οἶδα γὰρ αὐτὸν
 τῶν βασιλευουσῶν παρθενικῶν φθορέα.
 (Pall. *AP* 5.257)

Now I accuse even Zeus as a tepid lover,
 for not metamorphosizing for this haughty girl.
 For she is not left behind in beauty by Europa,
 or Danae, or delicate Leda.
 Unless he dismisses prostitutes, for I know
 that he was a corrupter of virgin princesses.⁷⁴

⁷² For mythological burlesque in Palladas, cf. e.g. Pall. *AP* 10.53 on Zeus' alleged favour for murderers (with W. J. Henderson 2008, 111–12). For Pall. *AP* 9.773 (on a statue of Eros melted into a frying pan) and Pall. *AP* 9.180–3 (on Tyche), see Bing's chapter in this volume. For myth in Palladas and the *P. CtyBR inv. 4000*, see W. J. Henderson (forthcoming).

⁷³ For this point, see also, independently, Floridi (2015a), 62 n. 24.

⁷⁴ Translation from W. J. Henderson (2008), 112, slightly adapted (the whole epigram is analysed at 112–13).

The whole epigram subverts the role of Zeus as guarantor of *dike* and punisher of transgressors, a role that dates back to Hesiod's *Works and Days* and *Theogony*. Already in the first distich, the forensic verb *καταγιγνώσκω* accentuates the burlesque: the god is accused for being an unenthusiastic lover. The so-called evidence brought against him follows: he did not change his form for the sake of the unnamed haughty girl, though she is as beautiful as Europa, Danae, and Leda (vv. 2–4). At first glance, her characterization as *σοβαρά* (v. 2) does not match the subsequent one as a *porne* in verse 5, where the speaker sarcastically suggests that the god rejects prostitutes because he prefers to corrupt virgins of noble birth. The term *porne* stresses the main difference between this woman and Zeus' former paramours; she offers her body in exchange for money.⁷⁵ The adjective *σοβαρά* can be explained, though: it expresses the prostitute's attitude towards the speaker. She rejects him, and this possibly implies that, despite the term *porne*, we are urged to think of a high-status, expensive courtesan who can have her pick of men.⁷⁶ Zeus, however, could have transformed himself to enjoy her charms, and one easily thinks of his metamorphosis into gold. However, he is a *φθορέυς* (v. 6). The term meaning ambiguously 'seducer' but also 'corrupter'⁷⁷—Zeus prefers to defile virgins—points to the ring composition, rounds off the censure, and adds to the sarcasm (note that *ἀνεράστου* and *φθορέα* are the last words of the verses).

I conclude my analysis with a later poem, Paul the Silentiary *AP* 5.217, which reinvigorates several motifs found in the preceding epigrams and confirms the long-standing reception of the mythological burlesque of this story in the genre:

χρύσεος ἀψαύστοιο διέτμαγεν ἄμμα κορείας
 Ζεύς, διαδὺς⁷⁸ Δανάας χαλκελάτους θαλάμους.
 φαμί λέγειν τὸν μῦθον ἐγὼ τάδε· χάλκεα νικᾷ
 τείχεα καὶ δεσμούς χρυσὸς ὁ πανδαμάτωρ.
 χρυσὸς ὅλους ρυτῆρας, ὅλας κληῖδας ἐλέγχει,
 χρυσὸς ἐπιγνάμπτει τὰς σοβαροβλεφάρους·
 καὶ Δανάας ἐλύγωσεν ὅδε φρένα. μή τις ἐραστῆς
 λισσέσθω Παφίαν, ἀργύριον παρέχων.

(Paul. Sil. *AP* 5.217)

5

⁷⁵ Leda was married to Tyndareus, so the term *παρθενικῶν* (v. 6) focuses on Danae and Europa.

⁷⁶ For the use of this adjective for women who reject men, or did so when they were young, see e.g. Agath. *AP* 5.273.2 & 8, 5.280.8, and 5.299.5, Phld. (or Antiphil.) *AP* 5.308.4 = Antiphil. *GPh* 14.4 with Sider (1997), 135–8, Rufin. *AP* 5.28.4 and 5.92.2 & 4. For the meaning of the adjective, see Page (1978), 44–6; Sider (1997), 137.

⁷⁷ *LSJ* s.v. *φθορέυς*.

⁷⁸ Cf. n. 11 in this chapter. Cf. Agath. *AP* 5.294, where a man 'slips diagonally into [sc. a virgin's well-secured] bedroom' (*διαδὺς λέχριος ἐν θαλάμῳ*, v. 10); Leon. *AP* 12.20.2 = *FGE* 39.2 (*εἰρπυσεν εἰς θαλάμους*, 'crept into the bedroom', said of Zeus).

Golden Zeus cut in two the knot of untouched maidenhood
 after slipping through Danae's bedchamber, fashioned in bronze.
 I say that what the myth means is this: Gold the all-subduer
 overpowers brazen walls and chains.
 Gold puts to shame all reins and all bolts,
 gold bends the will of the women with haughty eyes;
 this turned even Danae's mind around. Let no lover,
 who offers money, pay to the Paphian.

Gold is the medium through which you can overcome all hindrances and have sex with the woman you want; this is the gist of the epigram, which ends with an exhortation that challenges Aphrodite (vv. 7–8). The rationalization of the myth is in fact a four-line praise of gold, accentuated by the continuous repetition of the term; a thread of interrelated phrases confirms the characterization of gold as the 'all-subduer'. The brazen walls, chains, reins, and bolts allude to the myth and to Danae's imprisonment (χάλκεα τείχεα vv. 3–4 echoes χαλκελάτους θαλάμους v. 2), which did not hinder golden Zeus. At a metaphorical level, they stand for the difficulties set against the *exclusus amator*.⁷⁹ All obstacles are overcome if one pays.⁸⁰ The idea of gold as capable of bending the will of haughty ladies focuses on the last obstacle that a lover might have to overcome, namely the woman's resistance. The idea echoes Palladas AP 5.257, where 'golden' Zeus could have easily slept with the haughty woman.

An important model for Paul the Silentiary is Antipater of Thessalonica AP 5.31, as is demonstrated by the various similarities: both poems offer a rationalization of the myth (φαμί...πάδε v. 3 ~ δοκέω...έκατόν, vv. 5–6), although Antipater's 'reading' is more sarcastic; Paul uses all three metals (gold vv. 1, 4, 5 and 6, brass vv. 2 and 3, and silver v. 8) as Antipater does, and χρύσεος is the first word of each epigram; as in AP 5.31, an antithesis is created between the two metals—gold and brass—in the first two couplets, though Paul stays focused on the myth of Danae; both poets use the epithet Paphia for Aphrodite in the last distich; Danae is mentioned by name, and the bending of her morals is stressed in the last distich of each epigram to heighten the concept that gold is irresistible. In Paul's epigram, the repetition of Δανάας emphasizes the ring composition (vv. 1–7). Additionally, the phrase διαδὺς... χαλκελάτους θαλάμους (v. 2) adapts διὰ χαλκείων χρυσὸς ἔδυσ θαλάμων (AP 5.64.6) and shows that Asclepiades is another model of Paul.

⁷⁹ Pitts (2018) also makes this point; in her article she analyses the adaptation of earlier material in Paul. Sil. AP 5.217 and 5.230.

⁸⁰ For the topos, see e.g. Antip. Thess. AP 5.30.3–4; Maced. AP 5.240 (the lover uses gold to harvest Aphrodite's honey, i.e. sex); cf. Marc. Arg. AP 5.113 = *GPh* 9. In Paul. Sil. AP 5.275, the poet subverts the concept: a man rapes a girl because his attempts to seduce her with gold were fruitless (vv. 9–10).

More interestingly, I would stress that, in his praise of gold, Paul skilfully uses vocabulary and ideas that subvert topoi employed for the power of E/eros (both the god and the emotion) and Aphrodite, which can be traced back to Hesiod and Homer. For instance, in Hesiod's *Theogony* 122–3, the cosmogonic Eros, 'the limb-loosener, subdues the mind and sensible counsel in the chests of all gods and all men' (λυσιμελής, πάντων δὲ θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων | δάμναται ἐν στήθεσσι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν).⁸¹ The verb δάμναται is combined with the repetition of πάντων and here we detect the origins of the compound πανδαμάτωρ (AP 5.217.4), which merges the two words and is also found in Musaeus' description of Eros in his *Hero and Leander* 198–201.⁸² Similarly, in the *Dios apate* ('Deception of Zeus'), the god himself claims that desire has overcome his heart: οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὦδε θεᾶς ἔρος οὐδὲ γυναικός | θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι περιπροχυθεὶς ἐδάμασσεν ('for never yet has desire for a goddess or mortal woman so been poured all around my heart and overcome it within my breast', *Il.* 14.315–16).⁸³ In two words, for Paul, it is not E/eros that controls the actions of men, but gold.⁸⁴

3. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the selected epigrams reveals their humorous and skoptic side: criticism is hurled against various targets—Zeus and Danae, Agis, the prostitutes—according to the needs and desires of each individual epigrammatist. Asclepiades and Hedylus continue the burlesque of Zeus' erotic adventures, which thrived in mythological comedy of the fourth century BCE. Several epigrams (e.g. the ones mocking Zeus' seduction of Danae, or the ones parodying the abduction of Ganymedes) exemplify that the boundary between the erotic and skoptic subgenres was already blurred in Hellenistic epigram. This set of epigrams has both an erotic and a skoptic side and it is their placement in Books 5 and 12 or, alternatively, in Book 11 of the *Greek Anthology* that emphasizes their erotic or skoptic nature. The selected epigrams demonstrate the continuous development of this type of erotic-skoptic epigram that used mythological burlesque as its tool to achieve satirical effects up until Agathias' *Cycle*. Some epigrammatists were especially interested in

⁸¹ For a similar description of Aphrodite's power, cf. *Il.* 14.198–9; *h. Ven.* 1–5.

⁸² *Οἷσι δ' ἀνάσσει, αὐτὸς ὁ πανδαμάτωρ βουλευφόρος ἐστὶ βροτοῖσιν* ('and for those to whom he is the master, he himself the all-subduer is the counsellor for mortals'). Cf. Viansino (1963), 71.

⁸³ For the mental effect of eros on one's mind, cf. e.g. *Il.* 14.294 (for Zeus); *Il.* 3.442 (for Paris). Here gold controls Danae's mind.

⁸⁴ Leont. AP 16.285 deviates from the mainstream use of the mythological exemplum in the epigrammatic corpus and employs it for the praise of the gilded statue of a music girl; Zeus is said to have poured himself around the girl, as he did once for Danae. The mythological burlesque is evident, as the god does not come near Anthousa's body so as not to defile her against his will.

mythological burlesque; characteristic is the case of Antipater of Thessalonica who composed a series of such epigrams, this revealing his attempt to put his stamp on the genre and to highlight his skill among his peers.

Within the ancient epigrammatic corpus, apart from Greek epigrams, Martial 14.175 offers an adaptation of the myth of Zeus and Danae (inspired by a painting of Danae in the Temple of *Divus Augustus* at Rome): *cur a te pretium Danae, regnator Olympi, | accepit, gratis si tibi Leda dedit?* ('Why did Danae accept from you money, ruler of Olympus, if Leda gave herself to you for nothing?'). Ovid, one of Martial's models, had already presented such a portrayal of Danae in his *Amores* 3.8.29–34.⁸⁵ But we can go one step further. Both Ovid and Martial adapt Greek epigrams, Martial mingling the Greek and the Latin sources. Apart from the emphasis on the commerciality of Danae's body in several epigrams, Danae and Leda are found together in Bassus AP 5.125. Although we cannot speak of specific intertexts, Martial surely draws on the strands of this myth as it was developed in Greek epigram.⁸⁶ The equation of the golden rain to money and payment is explored in humorous and satirical adaptations composed by the writers of Philip's *Garland* (its first traces being found, as we have seen, in Hellenistic sources). Martial, following the example of his Greek models, uses keywords to allude to a whole myth: Jupiter is bluntly asked why Danae accepted money from him. The question demeans and mocks both him and Danae, leaving open the exact sense of criticism: Jupiter, the ruler of Olympus, is criticized for paying for what he previously obtained for free, and Danae is accused of having accepted the money, or she can even be imagined as acting like a shrewd courtesan who, unlike Leda, knows how to drive a hard bargain for her services.

In Ovid's *Amores* 3.8 the lover complains that the greedy beloved prefers the rich soldier to the poor poet; the myth is used as the ultimate mythological exemplum of the one who pays cash for a woman's sexual favours. 'Jupiter', the poet tells us, 'knowing well that nothing is more powerful than gold, turned himself into the price of the virgin's seduction (*Juppiter, admonitus nihil esse potentius auro, | corruptae pretium virginis ipse fuit*, vv. 29–30); 'without the bribery, her father was harsh, she herself severe, the door brazen, and the tower iron' (*dum merces aberat, durus pater, ipsa severa, | aerati postes, ferrea turris erat*, vv. 31–2), 'but when the cunning adulterer came in the form of a gift [i.e. with money], she willingly opened her arms and gave whatever she was ordered to give' (*sed postquam sapiens in munere venit adulter, | praebuilt ipsa sinus et dare iussa dedit*, vv. 33–4).⁸⁷ Money bent

⁸⁵ Leary (1998), 44.

⁸⁶ For the relationship between Martial and the writers of Philip's *Garland*, see Sullivan (1991), 83–4; Watson and Watson (2003), 32.

⁸⁷ Note that both Martial and Ovid use the terms *pretium* and *dedit* for sex (*dedit* is the last word of the pentameters).

Danae's will, as we already know from Ovid's epigrammatic models, and Ovid further adapts the myth by adding the idea that gold helped Jupiter to overcome parental opposition; Acrisius permitted his daughter's defilement due to financial gain.⁸⁸ The elegist brings together material from different epigrams, and Danae's venality is stressed through the use of four terms denoting payment and bribery (see the terms in bold). One recalls epigrams where this technique is used, for example in Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 5.31, with the repetition of gold; the idea of payment as 'a gift' (*in munere*) is also found in Parmenion *AP* 5.33.2.

In brief, the diachronic examination of the life cycle of the myth of Zeus and Danae shows how earlier Greek epigrams employed mythological burlesque to offer original and satirical adaptations of the myth, which were explored anew by Latin authors and late antique epigrammatists.⁸⁹

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Chris Carey, Lucia Floridi, Alan Griffiths, Ioannis Konstantakos, and above all Styliani Hatzikosta, for their useful comments on the final draft of this chapter.

⁸⁸ Intriguingly, the idea that a girl's father can profit from his daughter's defilement already occurs at Men. *Sam.* 589–98, and Zeus and Danae are used to bring the point home to the audience. So the possibility exists that there might have been a particular strand in the satirical adaptation of the myth that, although not surviving in the existing epigrams, Ovid knew and used.

⁸⁹ For the reception of Greek epigram in Latin poetry, see the chapters by Fantuzzi and Gutzwiller in this volume. It would be rewarding to pursue and analyse the life cycle of the myth of Zeus and Danae in Latin poetry (see n. 51 here) and to detect further implications. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer of OUP for the suggestion to tweak the use of Ovid's excerpt.

Epigrams on the Persian Wars

An Example of Poetic Propaganda

Federica Giommoni

1. INTRODUCTION

When the term ‘propaganda’ is used with reference to ancient texts, it usually stands for the planned spreading of values and beliefs concerning social and political ideologies that aimed at influencing public opinion.¹ Propaganda is all the more effective when it is subtly addressed to people’s unconscious and succeeds in both making them strongly believe in what they read or listen to and confirming existing convictions. In this regard, in every period of human history, kings and leaders have used poetry, statuary, and coinage as media for transmitting to the public a positive and influential image of themselves, related to concepts of victory and power, in order to maintain political consensus among their people.

In this chapter I first examine how some epigrams dating from the Hellenistic period onwards use the image of the king or emperor as being victorious over the ‘Persians’, meaning the Medes, the Seleucids, the Parthians, or the Sassanians, in order to convey propagandistic messages. As we shall see, under the Hellenistic sovereigns, who considered themselves in every respect the heirs of Alexander the Great, epigrams enable the dissemination of the iconic ideas of the unity and supremacy of the empire. This is also true of epigrams composed under the reign of Roman emperors who adopted features of the representation of the Hellenistic monarchs. In other words, I argue that in the surviving epigrammatic material, from Posidippus down to the ‘revival’ of the epigrammatic genre during the age of Justinian (in Agathias’ *Cycle*, c.567/8 CE), there is a clear-cut continuity in the way monarchy is conceived of and in the propagandistic use of the

¹ On what we mean by the term ‘propaganda’ when applied to ancient texts, see e.g. Taylor (2003); Enenkel and Pfeijffer (2005); Hornblower, Spawforth, and Eidinow (2014) s.v. propaganda.

depiction of the emperor as the people's patron against foreign enemies. In order to clarify the latter point, I examine as my case study the use in the *Cycle* of the legendary episodes about the role of Nemesis and Pan in the Battle of Marathon (490 BCE), a traditional symbol of victory over barbarians.² As a matter of fact, during Justinian's reign, the epigrammatists of the *Cycle* exploit this stronghold of Greek identity to celebrate Justinian's victory over the Sassanians and to strengthen his representation as ultimate heir of the glorious Hellenic past.

2. PROPAGANDA EPIGRAMS IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

Because of their close bonds with the royal court, Hellenistic epigrammatists such as Theocritus and Posidippus wanted to celebrate the image of their rulers, and so embedded in their poems themes connected with key features of Ptolemaic sovereignty. Although epigrams were not the main cultural tool of official propaganda as they were not planned directly by a state's cultural programme,³ nonetheless they served to convey assorted kinds of political messages. Propaganda in poetry appears to have been the medium for asserting the virtues of a given character or for supporting the validity of a given principle and promoting its acceptance among the audience. It is in this sense that the label 'propaganda epigram' is used in this chapter, in full awareness that in Ptolemaic Egypt (as well as in the Roman empire) the sovereigns aimed at achieving general consensus and that in every period of Greek history court poetry found its special *raison d'être* in the relationship built between a selected audience and its patron.⁴

Different epigrammatic subgenres seem to have been used as media for propaganda: consider, for instance, all the Hellenistic epigrams on the cult of Arsinoë Aphrodite Zephyritis, such as Theocritus *AP* 6.340 = *HE* 2 or the Posidippean series dedicated to the foundation of the deified queen's shrine by the admiral Callicrates on Cape Zephyrium (see e.g. 36 and 39 A–B).⁵ These are examples of dedicatory poetry in accordance with Ptolemaic propaganda that aimed at identifying Arsinoë II with Aphrodite for religious and

² According to *Hdt.* 6.105–6, Pan himself came to help the Athenians during the battle. Pausanias visited the ancient sanctuary of Nemesis, in the deme of Rhamnous, and tells us (1.33.2) about how Pheidias sculptured a statue of Nemesis from a marble block brought by the Persians who wanted to make a trophy out of it; the marble became instead the statue of the ruthless avenging goddess.

³ See Barbantani (2001), 36–8 and Barbantani (2010), 227, quoting helpful bibliography.

⁴ See again Barbantani (2001, 36–8; 2010, 227).

⁵ See L. Rossi (2001), 239–46; Bing (2002–3).

political purposes.⁶ Consider also the following epigrams, which belong to a different subgenre, the *iamatika* ('remedies'): Posidippus 95 and 101 A–B present the physician and priest Medeios of Olynthus, who had close ties with the Ptolemaic court and promoted its positive image, as the 'new' Asclepius.⁷

In this framework, one of the most crucial cultural points in the self-representation of the Lagid kings is their linkage with Alexander the Great.⁸ The presence of the Macedonian conqueror in the Milan Papyrus (*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309*) is massive⁹ and serves to establish a close connection between him and his heirs, under whose protection the Macedonian Posidippus composed many of his epigrams. It is especially Alexander's conflicts with the Persians that are employed as a means of portraying the Hellenistic kingdom as a victorious 'new world' into which all the foreign riches flow¹⁰ and before which foreign enemies must bow. Let us briefly examine, as our case study, an ecphrastic poem by Posidippus on Lysippus' bronze statue of Alexander:

Λύσιππε, πλάστα Σικυώνιε, θαρσάλεα χείρ,
 δάϊε τεχνίτα, πῦρ τοι ὁ χαλκὸς ὀρῇ,
 ὃν κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρου μορφᾶς ἔθξεν· οὐ τι γέ μεμπτοὶ
 Πέρσαι· συγγνώμα βουσιλέοντα φυγεῖν.
 (Posidipp. *APL* 119 = *HE* 18 = 65 A–B)

Lysippus, sculptor of Sicyon, bold hand,
 cunning craftsman, fire is in the glance of the bronze
 which you made in the form of Alexander. In no way can one blame
 the Persians: cattle may be forgiven for flying before a lion.¹¹

One of the most effective epigrammatic subgenres in terms of propagandistic usage is the ecphrastic one, since it exploits the dual—visual and verbal—power of ecphrasis, in line with other forms of the official self-representation of kings and queens, such as coins and statuary.¹² The epigram informs us that

⁶ Cf. Robert (1966), 201–2; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 385–7. For Arsinoe's image in Posidippus' epigrams, see Stephens (2004; 2005, 236–48). For the reception of the Homeric comparison of a mortal with Aphrodite in epigrams written by Ptolemaic court poets and its connection with the official propaganda, see now Kanellou (2016), 195–9.

⁷ See Di Nino (2008).

⁸ The bibliography on this topic is extensive, see at least Samuel (1993), 181.

⁹ Alexander's image unifies the entire Milan Papyrus; see e.g. Meliadò (2005), 204; Barbantani (2010), 230–1.

¹⁰ Although there was a cultural opposition towards the Persians, we must not forget that the Achaemenid royal propaganda was absorbed in the Hellenic conception of power and contributed to the formation of the Graeco-Roman image of the absolute king or emperor. On the role of Posidippus' *Lithika* in conveying this crucial ideological meaning, see I. Petrovic (2014). For an analysis of the *Lithika* in relation to the Ptolemaic court, see Hunter (2004); Bing (2005).

¹¹ For Posidippus' epigrams, I have used the edition and translations of Austin and Bastianini (2002).

¹² That is the case in Posidippus' epigrams about Arsinoe Aphrodite; see Stephens (2004). On this topic, see also Gutzwiller (2002), esp. 92.

just by looking at this statue of Alexander one can understand why ‘the Persians should no longer be blamed’ for having fled before him (vv. 3–4); it is its fiery look that associates the Macedonian ruler with the lion, revealing to observers Alexander’s power against his enemy.¹³ Since Alexander and the Ptolemies have an ancestor in common—they both descend from Heracles¹⁴—celebrating Alexander’s power against his enemy means shedding the same light on his Egyptian heirs, who also wanted to be called ‘Macedonians’.¹⁵

In the Milan Papyrus, Alexander’s presence is also evident in the case of ‘anecdotes’ from his Persian campaigns, as in the *Oionoskopika* 31 and 35 A–B. I quote the first epigram:

ἀετὸς ἐκ νε[φέ]ων καὶ ἄμα στεροπὴ καταβά[σα]
 νίκης οἶων[οὶ δε]ξιὸς ἐς πόλεμον
 Ἀργεάδαις βα[σιλε]ῦσιν, Ἀθηναίη δὲ πρὸ ναο[ῦ]
 ἔχνος κίνη[σεν δε]ξιὸν ἐκ μολύβου·
 οἶον Ἀλεξά[νδρ]ω ἐφάνη τέρας, ἥνικα Περσ[ῶν]
 ταῖς ἀναρ[ιθμ]ήτοις πῦρ ἐκύει στρατιαῖ[ς].
 (Posidipp. 31 A–B)

An eagle swooping from the [clouds] and lightning at the same time
 were auspicious victory omens in war
 for the Argead kings. And Athene, in front of her temple,
 stirred her auspicious right foot from the lead clamp.
 Such a portent appeared to Alexander, as he was teeming with fire
 against the countless armies of the Persians.

The Argead kings, Posidippus says, usually received victorious omens from the gods, but only for Alexander did the statue of Athena make a prodigious movement, announcing to him his imminent victory over the Persians. Alexander’s Persian campaign is also evoked in 35 A–B, an epigram on the bird diviner Strymon, whose tomb is said to be under a crow’s image: the seer was eulogized for having foretold that Alexander would win three victories over the Persians, and was awarded the title of ‘supreme steward of bird omens’ (ὀρνίθων ἀκρότατος ταμίης, v. 2).

From our viewpoint, what is most striking is that these epigrams parallel the iconography on Ptolemaic coinage, which often presented Alexander, or the goddess Athena, or an eagle on a thunderbolt;¹⁶ again, official propaganda and court poetry go hand in hand. It should be said that Macedonian victories over

¹³ On this comparison, which celebrates Alexander as a Homeric hero, see Prioux (2007), 70–1.

¹⁴ See e.g. *CIG* 5127 = *OGIS* 54; Theoc. *Id.* 17.26–7, both mentioned by Meliadò (2005), 203.

¹⁵ See Posidippus’ *Hippika*, with Fantuzzi (2005); this section of the Milan Papyrus also contributes to the creation and dissemination of the royal image of power. For sections of the Milan Papyrus as ‘court poetry’, see Bingen (2002), esp. 47–50.

¹⁶ Stephens (2004), 166 provides full evidence and a very convincing analysis.

the Persians are not a surprising topic in epigrams. We must not forget that these sorts of epigrammatic texts flourished amid literary compositions strongly connected with contemporary battles in which similar topics were used to establish a link between the Ptolemaic dynasty and Alexander. For instance, let us remember the fragmentary elegies *SH* 958 and 969 and some fragments from Euphorion, such as *CA* fragment 38 = 42 Lightfoot.¹⁷ In *SH* 958 and 969, a new enemy, the Galatians, is labelled with the ancient name 'Medes',¹⁸ which thus associates contemporary royal military exploits with ancient Greek glory and gives new life to the use of the Persian Wars.

Of course, inscriptional epigrams designed to celebrate war victories were composed well before the era of the Hellenistic kings; it is enough to think of the body of inscribed epigrams attributed to Simonides by historical authors such as Herodotus and Plutarch.¹⁹ However, there is a major difference here: unlike archaic inscriptional epigrams on the Persian Wars that eternalize contemporary events by employing current poetic motifs, Hellenistic epigrams glorify contemporary events by making use of literary images drawn from the classical past. In this respect, Hellenistic court poetry, and epigrams in particular, can be considered propaganda poetry in which 'contemporary history ... lurks behind literary topics'.²⁰

3. PROPAGANDA EPIGRAMS IN LATE ANTIQUITY AND EARLY BYZANTINE ERA

Later on in time, in the historical context of the resumption of hostilities against the East during the first centuries CE, ancient symbols of Greek supremacy over the Persians take on a new meaning and are used to 'advertize' imperial (real or alleged) military successes. Just as Hellenistic poets created connections between their patrons and illustrious ancestors, imperial and late antique epigrammatists chose symbols of bravery from the past to celebrate their emperors' military deeds. The association of the Roman emperor (or one of his generals) with a figure from the glorious Athenian past becomes a common practice of imperial official propaganda, especially when celebrating victories against the 'Persian' threat (i.e. the Parthians).²¹ Epigrams celebrating the emperor's deeds with this sort of association are quite hard to find in the

¹⁷ Cf. Magnelli (2013), 183.

¹⁸ See the accurate study of Barbantani (2001) on *SH* 958 and 969.

¹⁹ On archaic epigrams on the Persian Wars attributed to Simonides, see Higbie (2010); on Simonides' epigrams, see the excellent commentary of A. Petrovic (2007b).

²⁰ Magnelli (2013), 189.

²¹ See Spawforth (1994), 240–4, who also discusses the equation of the 'Parthians' with the 'Persians' under the Roman emperors.

first centuries CE, yet in the sixth century CE the technique resurfaces in the case of Emperor Justinian;²² thanks to a definite political and literary choice, the Battle of Marathon and its heroes, above all Miltiades, are employed for propagandistic purposes. In what follows we shall see how, in late antiquity just as in the Hellenistic period, epigrams composed by court poets reflected official guidelines for praising the emperor.

It is worth noticing that some of the most famous episodes of the very first Persian War acquired at an early date the status of an eminent symbol of Greek supremacy and were often used as rhetorical exercises. This is exhibited, for instance, in the following epigrams: Cornelius Longus *API* 117 = *FGE* 2²³ on the picture by Phasis²⁴ representing Aeschylus' brother Cynegeirus who fought and died at the Battle of Marathon;²⁵ Parmenion *API* 222 = *GPh* 15²⁶ on the statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous;²⁷ 'Simonides' *API* 232 = *FGE* 5 on the statue of Pan (supposedly) dedicated by Miltiades to the god in return for his divine contribution to the victory in the Battle of Marathon.²⁸ In later times, such common topics become a benchmark for those who wanted to compose literary epigrams in the 'ancient style', fitting in with the tradition of previous compositions. At first glance, this may seem to be precisely the case for some epigrams from Agathias' *Cycle*: in fact it would be quite easy to read them just as an attempt to rewrite their models for the sake of variation because, even in late antiquity, these very same subjects, especially Cynegeirus, were popular among imperial rhetoricians in the framework of school exercises, the *progymnasmata*.²⁹ However, as I argue, their authors had a quite different aim.

²² Because of this fact and due to space limitations, my focus will be on the epigrams from the *Cycle*.

²³ On the authorship of this poem, see Aubreton and Buffière (1980), 124 n. 4. Cornelius Longus was probably an author included in the *anthologion* of Diogenianus; on this collection of epigrams, see A. Cameron (1993), 84–90.

²⁴ Probably a fifth-century BCE painter; but, as Page (1981), 70 says, 'it would be surprising if a painting of that period survived into the time of Longus'. We have to remember that Cynegeirus was depicted, along with all other heroes and fighters of the Battle of Marathon, under the portico of the Stoa Poicile; see E. B. Harrison (1972).

²⁵ Anon. *AP* 11.335 and Crin. *AP* 7.741 = *GPh* 21 have also Cynegeirus as their subject.

²⁶ On Philip's *Garland*, see the chapters by Höschle and Campbell in this volume. Campbell analyses another epigram composed by Parmenion, namely *AP* 9.43 = *GPh* 6.

²⁷ On this subject, cf. anon. *API* 263 = *FGE* 71 with the chronologically later 'close rendering' made by Ausonius (*Aus. Epigr.* 22 Green); see Green (1991), 389. The anonymous epigrams *API* 222 and 223 also refer to Nemesis but not directly to the Nemesis at Rhamnous.

²⁸ On the doubtful attribution of this poem, see Aubreton and Buffière (1980), 289 n. 7; Higbie (2010), 200. Page (1981), 194–5 does not discuss the matter, but just wonders whether or not the epigram was contemporary with the Battle of Marathon. For the cult of Pan Tropaeophorus even under the Ptolemies, see Barbantani (2001), 73.

²⁹ Sources are cited in extenso in E. B. Harrison (1972), 374–5; cf. Vian (1990), 158; Favreau-Linder (2003), 147–54; Agosti (2013), 258–9; on Miltiades, cf. Chor. 18 (= *Declamationes* 4) Foerster/Richtsteig. On the rhetorical value of subjects such as Cynegeirus and Miltiades, see Schouler (2006).

Our late antique epigrams acquire a political significance if we evaluate them in the broader context of Emperor Justinian's fight against the Sassanians.

First, let me quote the *Cycle* epigrams that are most useful to us. I start with a poem on Cynegeirus composed by Paul the Silentiary, one of the most important contributors to the *Cycle*:

Μηδοφόνους μὲν χεῖρας ὑπὲρ γαμφοῖο κορύμβου
ναὸς ἀπορρυμένης ἐξέταμον κοπίδες,
ἀνίκα πον, Κυνέγειρε, φυγὰς ποτε φορτὶς ἐκείνα
ὥσπερ ἀπ' εὐναίας εἶχετο σᾶς παλάμας.
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς ἀπρὶξ δόρυ νήιον ἀμφιδακοῦσαι
ἄπνοον ὠμάρτευν τάρβος Ἀχαμενίους.
καὶ τὰς μὲν τις ἀνὴρ ἔλε βάρβαρος· ἃ δέ γε χειρῶν
νίκα Μοιβοπίους μίμνε παρ' ἐνναέταις.
(Paul. Sil. *APL* 118)

The hands that dealt death to the Medes were hewn off by axes
as they rested on the curved stern of the ship which was hastening away,
then, Cynegeirus, when that flying vessel
was held by your hand as if by a cable.
But even so, gripping tight the timber of the ship,
they accompanied the Persians, a lifeless terror to them.
Some barbarian took the hands, but their victory
remained with the inhabitants of Mopsopia.³⁰

Theaetetus³¹ epigrams *APL* 221 and 233³² concern the statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous and the statue of Pan (supposedly) dedicated to the god by Miltiades, respectively:

χιονέην με λίθον παλιναυξέος ἐκ περιωπῆς
λαοτύπος τμηξας πετροτόμοις ἀκίσι
Μῆδος ἐποντοπόρευσεν, ὅπως ἀνδρείκελα τεύξῃ,
τῆς κατ' Ἀθηναίων σύμβολα καμμονίης.
ὥς δὲ δαῖζομένους Μαραθῶν ἀντέκτυπε Πέρσαις
καὶ νέες ὕγροπόρουν χεύμασιν αἱμαλέοις,
ἔξεσαν Ἀδρήστειαν ἀριστώδινες Ἀθῆναι,
δαίμον' ὑπερφιάλοις ἀντίπαλον μερόπων.
ἀντιταλαντεύω τὰς ἐλπίδας· εἰμὶ δὲ καὶ νῦν
Νίκη Ἐρεχθεΐδαις, Ἀσσυρίοις Νέμεσις.
(Theaet. *APL* 221)

³⁰ For all epigrams from the *AP* and *APL*, I use texts from the second edition of Beckby and translations from Paton, vol. 5, occasionally slightly modified.

³¹ On the identity of this barrister, who was Agathias' colleague, see Cameron and Cameron (1966b), 14 and 18; Martindale (1992) s.v. *Theaetetus*, 1223–4; Schulte (2006), 58; Giommoni (2017), 87.

³² For a brand new commentary on these texts, see Giommoni (2017), 110–23.

I am a white stone which the Median sculptor
 quarried with his stonecutter's tools from the mountain where the rocks grow
 again, and he bore me across the sea to make of me images,
 tokens of victory over the Athenians.
 But when Marathon resounded with the Persian rout,
 and the ships voyaged on bloody waves,
 Athens, the mother of beautiful works, carved of meAdrasteia,
 the goddess who is the foe of arrogant men.
 I counterbalance vain hopes, and I am still
 a Victory to the Athenians, a Nemesis to the Assyrians.

ὕλοβάτας, φιλόδενδρος, ὀρεσσαύλου πόσις Ἀχούς,
 Πάν, σκοπός, εὐκεράου μαλοφύλαξ ἀγέλας,
 Πάν ὁ δασυκνάμων, ὁ πολύσπορος, ὃς μετανάστας
 ἔδραμον αἰχματῶν ἐς δάν Ἀσσυρίων,
 Μιλτιάδου στήσαντος ὁμάσπιδα περσοδιώκτην
 ἴσταμαι ἀκλήτου ξείνια συμμαχίης.
 ἄλλοις ἀκροπόλῃς· ὁ **Μηδοφόνος** δὲ δέδασται
 ξυνὸς ἐμὴν Μαραθῶν καὶ μαραθωνομάχοις.

5

(Theaet. *APL* 233)

The walker in the woods, the lover of the trees, the spouse of Echo who
 dwells on the hills, I, Pan, the scout, the keeper of the horned flock of sheep,
 Pan with the shaggy legs, the fruitful god, I who, leaving my home,
 ran to meet the warlike Assyrians in battle,
 stand here set up by Miltiades, as his fellow soldier and pursuer of the
 Persians, in return for my unsummoned succour.
 Let others stand on citadels, but Marathon, which slew the Medes,
 is the common portion of myself and the men who fought at Marathon.

That these texts follow on the heels of a strong literary tradition concerning the Battle of Marathon is shown by their position in Planudes' source(s): Paul's poem is placed after Cornelius Longus *APL* 117 = *FGE* 2; likewise, Theaetetus' epigrams are placed one after Parmenion *APL* 222 = *GPh* 15 and the other after 'Simonides' *APL* 232 = *FGE* 5. These literary epigrams are particularly significant because they exemplify how vivid the memory of certain events was and how popular their rhetorical exploitation: every poet, in every moment of Greek history, felt free to 'add new details' (e.g. Nemesis' speech, Pan's appearance, or the outcome of the epiphany in Theaetetus' epigrams) to a real historical event that had acquired the powerful status of myth.³³ In all these epigrams there is also an intense focus on the Medes, the typical ethnic name of the Greeks' enemy par excellence. In a similar vein, we have already seen how the Ptolemies reused this very same name to designate their enemies, thus stressing how overwhelming the adoption of the legacy of

³³ Cf. Higbie (2010), 200.

the past was and, furthermore, establishing an implicit comparison between past and present.

Although we can detect very specific intertextual gestures and variations in these late antique epigrams, such allusions need to be interpreted within the context of the conflicts of late antique emperors against the East, as we do in the case of the *Dionysiaca* by Nonnus of Panopolis—the model for the new poetic style—which Agathias and his fellow epigrammatists enthusiastically imitated. In other words, there is no doubt that our epigrammatists were acquainted with Nonnus' work, drawing and adapting material from it wherever possible; the 'Nonnian style' of our epigrams shows that the *Dionysiaca* became a 'new classic' and a model to be followed when writing epigrams in late antiquity. One should not be surprised to find in it the episode of Cynegeirus³⁴ and other themes used in the ecphrastic epigrams of Paul the Silentiary and Theaetetus.³⁵ Nonnus refers to Cynegeirus in Book 28 (*Dion.* 28.126–57), where he talks about Dionysus' army and mentions an Athenian warrior who lost both arms in battle but continued fighting, in imitation of Cynegeirus, the most famous Athenian hero. In Book 27, Nonnus refers to Pan as the future helper and defender of Athens in the Battle of Marathon. I quote the relevant lines:

καὶ θεὸς ἀγρονόμων, νομίης σύριγγος ἀνάσσων, αἰγίδος ὑμετέρης ἐπιδεύεται αἰγίβοτος Πάν, ὃς πρὶν ἀσυλήτοισιν ἑμοῖς σκήπτροισιν ἀρήγων μάρνατο Τιτήνεσσι, γαλακτοφόρου δὲ τιθήνης αἰγὸς Ἀμαλθείης ὀρεσίδρομος ἔπλετο ποιμήν· ῥύεο τὸν μετόπισθε βοηθόον Ἀθλίδι χάρμη, Μηδοφόνον ῥυτῆρα τινασσομένου Μαραθῶνος. ³⁶	295 300
---	--------------------------------

(Nonn. *Dion.* 27.294–300)

The god of countryfolk himself, lord of the pastoral pipes,
Pan the goatherd, needs your aegis cape.
He once competed with my inviolable sceptre
and fought against the Titans, he once was the mountain-ranging shepherd
of the goat Amaltheia, my nurse, who gave me milk;
save the future helper of the Athenian battle,
who shall slay the Medes and save shaken Marathon.³⁷

³⁴ On Panteleius, another late antique epic poet who refers to Cynegeirus, cf. Vian (1990), 158; Agosti (2013), 258–9; for the connection between this topic and the rhetoric exercise of *ethopoia*, see Agosti (2005), 39–40.

³⁵ Regarding Theaetetus' ecphrasis of the statue of Pan we must remember that, according to Sozomen (*Hist. eccl.* 2.5) and Nicephorus (8.33), there was a statue of Pan in Constantinople 'dedicated by Pausanias after the Persian wars'; see Page (1981), 194 n. 1.

³⁶ I use Vian's edition of Nonnus (1990), but in v. 300 I prefer Cunaeus' *Μαραθῶνος* instead of the *γενετῆρι* of the ms. L, accepted by Vian.

³⁷ Translation by Rouse (1940), slightly modified.

As has already been stressed, just as in the case of these Nonnian passages,³⁸ late antique epigrams on the Battle of Marathon must be read with an eye on contemporary historical events, namely the continuous state of war against the East. Battles such as the one at Marathon took on a political meaning and became 'an image of the fight between the Mediterranean world and the East',³⁹ both in the epigrams and in the *Dionysiaca*. This aspect of the poetry under examination here was brilliantly pointed out by Pierre Chuvin in a personal suggestion to Francis Vian concerning his edition of the *Dionysiaca*: *ces épigrammes jumelles témoignent de la popularité dont les guerres médiques ont joui dans l'Antiquité tardive à cause des conflits contre les Sassanides* ('these twin epigrams [sc. Theaet. *APL* 221 and 233] testify to the popularity that the Persian Wars have enjoyed in late antiquity on account of the conflicts against the Sassanians').⁴⁰

So, when taking into account this historical and literary context, can we legitimately consider the poems of the *Cycle* as propaganda epigrams? We have already seen how in the Hellenistic period some particularly famous episodes (which were, in a certain sense, the stuff of legend) concerning Alexander the Great and his conflicts with the Persians were used to shed the same illustrious light on his political heirs, helping them to acquire a precise royal image and spread a political ideology. In exactly the same way, the contributors to Agathias' *Cycle*—court poets once again, just like Posidippus and other Hellenistic epigrammatists—associate the image of Emperor Justinian, who was facing an eastern threat, with prominent figures of the Greek past, both to keep alive the memory of certain historical events and to propagandize the emperor's victorious deeds.

Let us go back to our epigrams and take a closer look at them to clarify their political and propagandistic usage. In Theaetetus' epigrams, the conscious use of the ancient ethnic names *Μῆδος* and *Ἑρεχθείδαις* (*APL* 221.3 and 10) expresses symbolically the two opposing factions—the Sassanians and the Greeks; and this use creates a parallel between the symbolic value of Theaetetus' 'Medes' and the 'Medes' in the Hellenistic encomiastic poetry mentioned earlier in this section (*SH* 958 and 969).⁴¹ Just as the Lagids called themselves 'Macedonians', the Greeks of the sixth century CE would recognize themselves in the (culturally prestigious) Athenians, the descendants of Erechtheus (*Νίκη Ἑρεχθείδαις*, *APL* 221.10). Similarly, on the contemptuous side, the 'Assyrians' Theaetetus refers to in *APL* 221.10 (*Ἀσσυρίους Νέμεσις*) and *APL* 233.4 (*ἔδραμον αἰχματᾶν ἐς δάιν Ἀσσυρίων*) stand for the Sassanians,

³⁸ For a commentary on these verses, see Vian (1990), 158 and 309; Agosti (2013), 238–9 and 258–62.

³⁹ Agosti (2013), 239.

⁴⁰ Vian (1990), 309.

⁴¹ The term *Μῆδος* is used not only in Theaetetus but also, for instance, in Agath. *AP* 9.641, a poem on the construction of the Sangarius Bridge after Justinian's victory, and in the anon. *APL* 72, on a statue of Emperor Justin II. Both poems express propagandistic ideas; see Barbantani (2001), 132 and, for *APL* 72, Cameron and Cameron (1966a).

just like in Callimachus' *Aetia* (fr. 110 Pf./Harder = 213 Massimilla and frs 505 and 506 Pf.), where the term has derogatory force too.⁴² But these connections are not adequate. As we shall see, late antique epigrams should be read, just like the Hellenistic epigrams, in the broader context of contemporary eulogistic poetry and, even more, in relation to the emperor's official propaganda.

Continuing the analysis of the language and style of our epigrams, we notice that both Paul the Silentiary and Theaetetus use the adjective *Μηδοφόνος*, which is also employed in Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* (27.300).⁴³ The adjective is already attested well before Nonnus, in two epigraphic texts. One is Kaibel (1878), 30⁴⁴ = GE 186 = GV 1466 = ISE 24, a sepulchral epigram from Salamina that dates from around the third century BCE.⁴⁵ This is the epitaph of Leon, an Athenian cleruch who died in Salamina in one of the battles during the Wars of the Diadochi (third century BCE). The inscription declares that Leon 'remember[ed] the bravery of Mede-slaying fathers' (*Μηδοφόνων ἀρετὰς μνηόμενος πατέρων*, v. 6), in other words the courage that brave Greek warriors exhibited in the first Persian War.⁴⁶

The second relevant poem—a dedication of some apples to Apollo by a rhetorician or a victorious herald⁴⁷—comes from Athens and probably dates from the first centuries of the common era:

σοὶ τὰδ' Ὀνήτ]ωρ μῆλα, πατρώϊε, σήματα νίκης
 Πυθώης ἱερῆς τ' ἀντίθεμ' εὐεπίης
 τὸν Νεμέη Θήβη τε καὶ εὐρύχορος Λε[βάδεια
 Μηδοφόνος τε Πλάται' ἡγλά[ισεν στεφάνοις.
 (EG 931 = Robert 97, vv. 1–4)

To you, god of our fathers, I, Onetor, offer these apples,
 signs of my Pythian victory and my sacred poetic eloquence:
 I, whom Nemea and Thebes and spacious Lebadeia
 and Mede-slayer Plataea glorified with crowns.⁴⁸

⁴² See Magnelli (2013), 189–90. In a similar way, the adjective *ὑπερφίαλος* in Theaet. *API* 221.8, just like *ὑβρισταί* in *SH* 958.9, recalls the idea of the Persian arrogance; see Barbantani (2001), 147–59.

⁴³ Especially in late antiquity, all the *-φόνος* compounds represent a typical characteristic of the language of the encomiastic epigram; see Whitby (2003), 597.

⁴⁴ See Barbantani (2001), 132 n. 208, where the author cites our epigrams from Agathias' *Cycle*.

⁴⁵ Around 228 BCE, according to Geffcken (1916), 74; Moretti (1967), 51 thinks of a period around the second half of the third century BCE.

⁴⁶ See Moretti (1967), 51, who notes that, according to modern scholars, the place in which this epigram was found (Ambelaci) is the same as that where the Greek naval camp was set before the battle of 480 BCE.

⁴⁷ See Robert (1949), 97.

⁴⁸ My translation.

Here Plataea is called *Μηδοφόνος*, a characterization that clearly refers to the battle of 479 BCE and is intended in praise of the town. It seems that after these two inscriptional occurrences the adjective always remained associated in literary texts with the Persian Wars.

Take for instance an epigram composed by Bassus, inspired by the small collection of epigrams on Leonidas' grave, and quoted by Herodotus (7.228):⁴⁹

Φωκίδι πὰρ πέτρῃ δέρκευ τάφον· εἰμὶ δ' ἐκείνων
τῶν ποτε *Μηδοφόνων* μνᾶμα τριηκοσίων,
οἳ Σπάρτας ἀπὸ γᾶς τηλοῦ πέσον ἀμβλύναντες
Ἄρεα καὶ Μῆδον καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιον.
ἦν δ' ἐσορῆς ἐπ' ἐμέι' εὐβόστρυχον εἰκόνα θηρός,
ἔννεπε τοῦ ταγοῦ μνᾶμα Λεωνίδεω.

5

(Bass. AP 7.243 = GPH 2)

Look on this tomb beside the Phocian rock. I am
the monument of those three hundred Mede-slayers of old,
who died far from Sparta, having dimmed
the might of Media and Lacedaemon alike.
As for the image of a hairy beast upon me,
say that this is the monument of the commander Leonidas.

Another relevant passage comes from *De gloria atheniensium* 349b–c, in which Plutarch, in speaking about the Athenians' political and military virtues, mentions Miltiades and Themistocles, describing the first as a 'Mede-slayer' and the latter as a 'Persian-slayer' (*Μιλτιάδου τοῦ Μηδοφόνου . . . τοῦ περσοκτόνου Θεμιστοκλέους*).

These two sources confirm that in antiquity the adjective *Μηδοφόνος* was always used as a strong link to the most famous places and heroes of the Persian Wars. In this respect, the more we investigate its late antique usage the more we can understand the propagandistic value of the three epigrams from Agathias' *Cycle*. Actually, if we take into consideration contemporary sixth-century encomiastic poems, including two (most probably) official and originally inscriptional epigrams that celebrate the Romans' victory over the Sassanians, we realize that even official propaganda used the *Μηδοφόνος* metaphor—as we can call it—to connect the image of victorious Justinian with the glorious past of ancient Greece.

The first Persian War led by Emperor Justinian against Kings Kavadh and Chosroes I took place in the years 504–532 CE;⁵⁰ in 530 CE, the eastern Roman army under Belisarius' leadership defeated the Sassanians in the Battle of Dara.⁵¹ The victory led to the 'eternal peace', confirming the

⁴⁹ On the Simonidean authorship of these poems, see Page (1981), 231–4; A. Petrovic (2007b), 62–8; for their analysis, see A. Petrovic (2007b), 236–44.

⁵⁰ See Greatrex (1998).

⁵¹ Cf. Procop. *Pers.* 1.13–14, 59–73 Haury.

supremacy of the eastern Roman empire over the Sassanians—yet only superficially, since in fact a true peace was obtained only by payment.⁵² Nevertheless, there was a huge effort to propagandize the victory. To judge from ancient sources, Justinian commissioned John Lydus to compose either a panegyric poem or, more likely, a historical account,⁵³ and a bronze equestrian statue of the emperor was erected in the Hippodrome.⁵⁴ Two anonymous epigrams celebrating the victory, *APL* 62 and 63, are presented as engraved on that statue:⁵⁵

ταῦτά σοι, ὦ βασιλεῦ **Μηδοκτόνε**, δῶρα κομίζει
 σῆς Ῥώμης γενέτης καὶ πάις Εὐστάθιος,
 πῶλον ὑπὲρ νίκης, Νίκην στεφανηφόρον ἄλλην,
 καὶ σὲ μετνημέϊω πῶλῳ ἐφεζόμενον.
 ὑπόσ', Ἰουστινιανέ, τεὸν κράτος· ἐν χθονὶ δ' αἰεὶ
 δεσμὸς ἔχοι Μήδων καὶ Σκυθέων προμάχους.
 (anon. *APL* 62)

5

These gifts, O King, Mede-slayer, are brought to you
 by Eustathius, the father and son of your Rome:
 a horse for your victory, another laurelled Nike,
 and yourself seated on the horse swift as the wind.
 Your might, Justinian, is set on high, but may ever in chains on the ground
 the champions of the Persians and the Scythians lie.

πῶλον ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνακτα καὶ ὀλλυμένην Βαβυλῶνα
 χαλκὸς ἀπὸ σκύλων ἔπλασεν Ἀσσυρίων.
 ἔστι δ' Ἰουστινιανός, ὃν ἀντολῆς ζυγὸν ἔλκων
 στήσεν Ἰουλιανὸς μάρτυρα **Μηδοφόνον**.
 (anon. *APL* 63)

The bronze from the Assyrian spoils moulded
 the horse and the monarch and Babylon perishing.
 This is Justinian, whom Julian, holding the balance of the East,
 erected, his own witness to his slaying of the Medes.

⁵² See Greatrex (1998), 213–18.

⁵³ Cf. Lyd. *Mag.* 3.28 Schamp. The work does not survive; cf. Claudia Rapp (2005), 385; Bell (2009), 196 n. 31. It is worth noticing that even under Emperor Anastasius the victory over Sassanians formed the cornerstone of inspiration for a historical poem, the (now also lost) Coluthus' *Persica* (*Suda* s.v. *Κόλουθος*, κ 146 Adler); cf. A. Cameron (1970a), 25.

⁵⁴ See Greatrex (1998), 185 n. 37. According to Procop. *Aed.* 1.2.1–12 Haury, some years later, in 542 CE, Justinian placed in front of the Senate House in the Augustaion another equestrian statue, from the age of Theodosius II, 'in order to show himself facing down the Persians', as Bell (2009), 196 n. 31 states; see also Mango (1993), 2–8; Greatrex (1998), 185 n. 37.

⁵⁵ On the poems, their inscriptional status, problems of identification and authorship, see A. Cameron (1977), 42–6; Mango (1986a), 117–18; Croke (1980), 192–4; Greatrex (1998), 185; Schulte (1990), 132–5. On the statue, still surviving in the eighth century CE, cf. *Parastaseis* 61, 138–9 and 251 Cameron/Herrin.

As we can see, the adjective *Μηδοφόνος*, employed in our epigrams from the *Cycle* and its variation, *Μηδοκτόνος*, are also used by the anonymous author(s) of these two poems.

The adjective is also employed in Paul the Silentiary's *Description of the Hagia Sophia*. In this poem, where Paul celebrates the new church, he injects the praise of the emperor's glorious deeds by saying: *Μηδοφόνων ἀβόγητα μένοι κλέα σήμερον ἔργων* ('Let the glories of Mede-slaying works remain unproclaimed today', v. 138). Paul's poem, one of the most important panegyric ecphrases of his time, was recited in 562 CE in Hagia Sophia during an official ceremony, a few days after the second inauguration of the church once the dome had been rebuilt, and just one year before another peace treaty was made with Persia.⁵⁶

What matters from my perspective here is that all these ecphrastic poems celebrate the greatness of Emperor Justinian and his successes against the Persians and clearly show that an association was made between the greatness of his victories and the Greeks' triumph at the Battle of Marathon. These texts share with contemporary literary epigrams such as *APL* 118, 221, and 223 the use of a rhetorical and ideological tradition concerning the Persian Wars, as is crystal clear in the application of the adjective *Μηδοφόνος* and of the archaic 'Medes'. Hence the three epigrams under examination were not composed just as adaptations of earlier poems that dealt with the Battle of Marathon: along with official propaganda poems, they contributed to the dissemination of Justinian's successes by using one of the most popular symbols of Greek identity and pride, that of Miltiades and the Marathon heroes. Taking into account the poems discussed in this chapter, it is clear how strong the heritage of Hellenism was in late antiquity, in poetry and in politics. Keeping alive the Greek past as well as the Greek cultural and political identity was a fundamental concern for a 'Roman' (in fact, proto-Byzantine) emperor. Once again, we should underline the convergence of poetry, imperial official terminology, and iconography: the use of Greek exempla in these propaganda poems is in fact far from surprising, if we think of the official imperial practice⁵⁷ and the panegyric Greek poetry of the fifth century CE (for the most part lost, unfortunately), which associates the *laudandi* with Greek mythical figures or others belonging to the glorious Greek past.⁵⁸ Telling instances are Heitsch (1961–4), 2: S. 10 = *GLP* 141, an anonymous panegyric poem from Egypt transmitted on a papyrus and whose subject, a victorious general, is compared to Themistocles while his enemy, probably the Blemmyes, is compared to the Persians (*Πέρσαι[ι] ἀναπνεύσωσι Θεμιστοκλήα φηγόν[τες]*), 'the Persians may

⁵⁶ On the dedication of the Hagia Sophia and the strong propagandistic meaning of Paul's poem, see Whitby (1985); Macrides and Magdalino (1988).

⁵⁷ See n. 21 here. For the age of Justinian, it suffices to think of the Barberini ivory.

⁵⁸ See A. Cameron (1970a), 356.

breathe again, for they have escaped their Themistocles', *GLP* 141.4);⁵⁹ and Pamprepus' fragment 4.39–40 Livrea, where the influential Athenian aristocrat Theagenes is called 'a new Miltiades' (ἄλλον αἰείσω Μιλτιάδ[η]ν).

The fact that the *Μηδοφόνος* metaphor became a symbol of the supremacy of the eastern Roman empire over the Persians is confirmed by *API* 46, an anonymous inscriptional epigram included by Planudes in the fourth book of his anthology:⁶⁰

Νικήταν δορίτολμον ἄναξ, στρατός, ἄστεα, δῆμος
 στήσαν ὑπὲρ μεγάλων Μηδοφόνων καμάτων.
 (anon. *API* 46)

The emperor, the army, the cities, and the people erected the statue of the bold in war Nicetas for his great exploits in slaying the Persians.

This epigram is dedicated to Nicetas, general and cousin of Emperor Heraclius, who led the victorious expedition against King Chosroes II (614 CE).⁶¹ Many statues were erected in Constantinople in his honour, and Emperor Heraclius' triumph was solemnly celebrated by George of Pisidia, the greatest poet of his age.⁶² Once again, we can see the legacy of the glorious past of Greece being recalled (*Μηδοφόνων*, v. 2) in order to glorify the greatness of its heirs: this is a sign of ideological continuity between the early Byzantine period and late antiquity.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The Marathon epigrams included in the *Cycle* have a clear propagandistic function, as they present an image of Emperor Justinian as the new *Μηδοφόνος*. On the one hand, we can only fully understand these poems if we consider them against the tradition of inscriptional epigrams, following the words of Averil Cameron: 'they [Agathias and his friends] were not writing in a *vacuum*. There was a lively background of contemporary inscriptional epigrams against which their poems must be judged.'⁶³ On the other hand,

⁵⁹ This text (translation from *GLP*), also mentioned by A. Cameron (1970a), 356, has been brought to my attention, during the conference, by Silvia Barbantani (whom I thank); see Barbantani (2001), 131, providing many other similar examples. On *GLP* 141, cf. Viljamaa (1968), 51–3; Miguélez Caverio (2008), 76–7.

⁶⁰ On this epigram and the image that accompanied it, see Mango (1986b), 30–1.

⁶¹ On the 'Persian War' of Heraclius, see Kaegi (2003).

⁶² See Whitby (1998), 250–1 and *passim*. For the survival in the seventh century CE of the interpretation of the Persian Wars in political perspective, cf. the ideological interpretation of Nonnus by George of Pisidia, as pointed out by Gonnelli (2003), 11–13.

⁶³ A. M. Cameron (1970), 18.

one should recall the use of Alexander's victories against the Persians for the construction of Ptolemaic self-representation in the Hellenistic epigrams. Like the Ptolemies, Justinian used well-known models of bravery drawn from the Greek past to construct a victorious image of himself against his enemies from the East. Continuity in the use of particular symbols of bravery in an emperor's representation can be found in the literary epigrams from Agathias' *Cycle* analysed in this chapter, as they use exactly the same motifs as a means of propaganda.

‘From atop a lofty wall . . .’

Philosophers and Philosophy in Greek Literary Epigram¹

Joseph M. Romero

1. INTRODUCTION

Athenaeus 4.162a preserves an epigram attributed to the Hellenistic historian Hegesander of Delphi (mid-second century BCE), which grandiloquently addresses philosophers:

ὄφρυνασπασίδαι, ῥινεγκαταπηξιγένειοι,
σακκογενειοτρόφοι καὶ λοπαδαρπαγίδαι,
εἵματανωπερίβαλλοι, ἀνηλιποκαιβλεπέλαιοι,
νυκτιλαθραιοφάγοι, νυκτιπαταιπλάγιοι,
μειρακιεξαπάται καὶ συλλαβοπενσυλαηταί,
δοξοματαιόσοφοι, ζηταρετησιάδαι.

5

(FGE anon. 155)

You who raise eyebrows in scorn, with nutcracker chins and noses,
rearers of beards big as coarse-hair sacks, and snatchers of dishes,
who utterly shroud yourselves in your cloaks, bare of foot and bleary-eyed,
who nightly eat in secret, by night roaming to and fro,
deceivers of youths, and who talk in questions about syllables,
philosophers of foolish doctrines, seekers of virtue.²

¹ My subtitle is a tribute to Clayman (2007), whose essay on the subject is as elegant as it is perceptive and whose lead I have tried to follow. S. A. White (1994), 144–6 gives a dense and rare synoptic overview of the subject. Gutzwiller (1998), Fantuzzi (2004), and Livingstone (2010) take up this theme as relevant in the course of their general surveys.

² To translate, I borrow freely from Gow and Page (1965; 1968), Page (1981), and Paton (1916–18) (and I use, of course, the *LSJ*). For the Greek texts I have used the same editions.

Amid the flurry of Aristophanic compounds, our poet neglects to include a prescription, though one can only assume that those addressed would be exhorted to 'be gone' (ἀποχωρεῖτε). Although it is tempting to identify the objects of derision as Cynics, Page is clearly right that what is relevant here is that they are philosophers at all.³ It is the pursuit of philosophy more than the species of philosophy they practice that is absurd, but one must ask, in comparison to what? In this instance, which may serve as example for one type of poem written from Aristophanes to the Byzantine period, the philosopher acts as a foil to the discursive practice of the epigrammatic poet.⁴

In this chapter I make a foray into the subject of philosophers⁵ and philosophy in Greek literary epigram. So far as inscribed epigram is concerned, a relatively small number of sepulchral epigrams mention the philosophical dispositions of the deceased.⁶ The number of epigrams on philosophers and philosophy from the *Palatine Anthology* and of those supplemented from the edition of Maximus Planudes dating from 1301 is, conservatively, smaller than 150. With the addition of epigrams preserved in later authors⁷ and papyri,⁸ our total is not greater than a few hundred. Of the total number of verse epigrams surviving from classical antiquity,⁹ this must represent a very small number

³ See Page (1981), 475–6, who cites Pratinas *PMG* 708.10–11, *Ar. Lys.* 456–7, *Ran.* 966, and *Ec.* 1169–74 as examples of Aristophanic compounds. On Socrates in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, see Konstan (2011). On the ubiquity of Cynics in Greek literary epigram, see Page (1981), 475.

⁴ E.g. Agath. *AP* 11.354 (see nn. 19 and 78 in this chapter).

⁵ P. Zanker (1995) traces the representation of the philosopher in classical antiquity. His study of the sculptural portraiture and literary representation of intellectuals ranges over nine centuries.

⁶ Inscriptional sepulchral epigrams on real philosophers are relatively rare: see e.g. *EG* 600, Naples: Pompeius Diocles, Epicurean (?); Hiller von Gaertringen (1912), Rhodes: Arideices, Middle Academy. Mentions of philosophical allegiance in such epigrams are more common: e.g. *GG* 470 (Socrates and Plato rather than Epicurus); *GG* 189 (Plato); *GG* 201 (Epicurus); *GG* 414 (Pyrrho); *GV* 1451 (Plato), and the relevant entries in the index to *SGO*, vol. 5 ('Persönlichkeiten der Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte (Dichter, Historiker, Philosophen, Künstler)'), pp. 305–7. On the relationship between literary and inscribed epigram, which lies beyond the modest ambitions of this chapter, see e.g. Reitzenstein (1893; 1907); Häusle (1979); Gutzwiller (1998); Aloni and Iannucci (2007); Day (2007); Bing (2009); and the chapters by Barbantani, Day, Demoen, and Hunter in this volume.

⁷ Not infrequently included in Gow and Page (1965; 1968); Page (1981).

⁸ See e.g. those preserved in *Pap. Mil. Vogl. VIII* 309 and *P. CtYBR inv. 4000*.

⁹ On calculating surviving literary verse epigrams, see Bing and Bruss (2007b), 1–26, who cleverly do not venture a number. As a conservative and solely illustrative measure, if we were to take merely those 140 epigrams that I have included from the *Greek Anthology* as a percentage of the epigrams preserved in *AP* 5–15 and *APL*—that is, 3,807 poems (and one might certainly quibble about which ones are securely identified)—literary epigrams on *sophoi* constitute only 3.678 per cent of that total. Adding another few dozen (twenty-three, to be precise) of the many more literary epigrams that survive in the *Greek Anthology* as well as in other authors and on papyri would dilute that percentage still further, which may indicate that the editors of the *Greek Anthology* had a predilection for such epigrams. The true number is unknown and a corpus of literary epigrams on *sophoi* is needed. Such a task requires, among other things, a thorough re-evaluation of Diogenes Laertius.

indeed, though the number could probably be expanded significantly if we were to include every epigram whose diction and content include philosophical terminology. Epigrams on the Seven Sages were probably first gathered together in the second half of the fourth century BCE by the Peripatetic scholar Lobon of Argos, though we cannot say whether they were collections of inscribed epigrams or Lobon's literary inventions.¹⁰ That such collections of epigrams on *sophoi* circulated in Hellenistic and later times is probable but lacks proof.¹¹ Named poets composed epigrams on philosophers and philosophy from the early Hellenistic period¹² straight through to Agathias' *Cycle* (sixth century CE);¹³ many anonymous poems on this theme may safely be assigned to this later period as well.¹⁴

What follows is a thematic and largely synchronic analysis of some poems that I think best illustrate key, but not all, elements of the logic or rhetoric of our theme in epigram. First I investigate epigram as a medium of praise or blame, where the philosopher (the *laudandus*, in the parlance of Elroy Bundy)¹⁵ or, metonymically, his philosophy is exalted or vilified in accordance with the conventions of the kind of epigram being written: funerary, skoptic, or some other kind. After establishing the encomiastic and skoptic range that 'philosophical' epigrams display, I examine a smaller set of poems, in which the epigrammatist takes issue not merely with the philosopher or a school of philosophy as an exemplar of the *genus grande* but with philosophy in general. In such cases, it makes sense to think of the poems as small moments in the ancient quarrel between poetry and philosophy (see Plato's *Republic* 607b5–6).

¹⁰ Garulli (2004), 70–167, esp. 141–7. In her review, Gutzwiller (2008) argues that Lobon was probably a collector of such epigrams, not a composer.

¹¹ Of the fifty or so epigrams on philosophers in *AP* 7.83–134, all but six are found in Diogenes Laertius, which suggests that he had such a collection or collections to hand. On epigrams in Diogenes Laertius, see Nietzsche (1870); Dorandi's edition (2013) has an excellent but (necessarily) selective bibliography.

¹² Numerous examples are cited in S. A. White (1994), 144–6. Among others, note Timon of Phlius *SH* 799, Call. *AP* 7.471 = *HE* 53, and Simias *AP* 7.60 = *HE* 6; on the last two epigrams, see pp. 302–4 and 291–3 in this chapter.

¹³ E.g. third century CE: *AP* 7.83–7, D.L. *AP* 7.95–6, 7.101–2, 7.104–6 and many others; fifth century CE: Proclus *AP* 7.341; fifth–sixth century CE: Christodorus of Thebes *AP* 2.16 and 2.131, Jul. Aegypt. *AP* 325; sixth century CE: Agath. *AP* 11.352 and 11.354. See also Leo Phil. *AP* 15.12.

¹⁴ I leave aside the Simonidean, Theognidean, and Anacreontic corpora, though in the lattermost there is much of interest for our theme. See e.g. Rosenmeyer (1992), 192–208 on Anacreontic allusion to Plato. With some hesitation, I do not include the many poems ascribed to philosophers (some wrongly, some probably rightly) that Page (1981), 117–308 collects under the heading 'Epigrams Ascribed to Famous Names of the Pre-Alexandrian Period'; I leave out the poetry attributed to named philosophers not only because they are probably not authentic but also because, as in the case of those ascribed to 'Plato', the work of a poet *qua* poet need not have anything to do with his philosophical work. On the exception to the rule, Philodemus, see Sider (1997), 31–2; Clayman (2007), 512–17.

¹⁵ Bundy (1962), 4, 7, 11, and *passim*. On encomiastic conventions, see Miller (1986). On praise and blame as a core feature of Indo-European poetics, see Nagy (1979; 1990).

In lieu of a conclusion—for what I present here can only be what I see as a way forward with the mass of material before us—I offer a reprise of my chief arguments, together with a reading of Callimachus AP 7.471 = HE 53, from which I have taken my title (ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ τεύχεος, v. 2), a poem where we stand somewhat precariously with Cleombrotus the Ambracian before his fatal leap of faith.

2. STRATEGIES OF PRAISE AND BLAME

Praise is inherent in the epigrammatic register: the deceased receives his or her share of *kleos*, the god receives the dedicator's praise, the *eromenos* or *eromene* receives the praise of the *erastes*. In some cases praise is an end in itself, while in others it is a means to an end. In this section I examine the practice of praising deceased philosophers through a sampling of two fairly typical epitaphs and one skoptic epigram that mingles praise and blame. I then turn in earnest to the more numerous instances in literary epigram where philosophers and their ideas are targeted for detraction.¹⁶

2.1. Praise

σωφροσύνη προφέρων θνητῶν ἦθαι τε δικάϊω
 ἐνθάδε κείται ἀνὴρ θεῖος Ἀριστοκλῆς·
 εἰ δέ τις ἐκ πάντων σοφίης μέγαν ἔσχευ ἔπαινον,
 οὗτος ἔχει πλείστον καὶ φθόνον οὐ φέρεται.
 (Sim. AP 7.60 = HE 6¹⁷)

Excelling mortals in prudence and justice,
 here lies a divine man, Aristocles:
 but if anyone at all acquires great praise for philosophical wisdom,
 this man gets the most, and he bears no envy, too.

Here Simias observes several of the conventions of funerary epigram:¹⁸ the deceased, Plato, is introduced with the common formula ἐνθάδε κείται,

¹⁶ For literary epigrams praising or blaming specific targets, see e.g. the chapters by Campbell, Floridi, Giommoni, and Kanellou in this volume.

¹⁷ The identification is not secure; see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 515.

¹⁸ In general, see Lattimore (1942). For a convenient summary of epitaphic topics, see Bettenworth (2007), 70–3, which includes the burial formula ἐνθάδε κείται (or something like it), the name of the giver, the age of the deceased, the manner of death, praise, and lamentation or consolation. Of course, no poet needs to use all topics. For *epitaph* as praise of the dead (as opposed to *hymn*, praise of gods, and *encomium*, praise of the living), see Menander Rhetor 2.11, 418–22 Russell/Wilson and Theon Rhetor 109.24–6 Spengel, cited in Miller (1986), 5 n. 13; see *ibid.*, 5–8 for a more extensive list of encomiastic topics, which I repeat here: *genos* (origin, including ethnicity, country, ancestors, parents), *anatrophe* (upbringing, including

which is delayed until the second line; the epigram begins instead with a reference to the virtue (*σωφροσύνη*) by which the philosopher is marked.¹⁹ However, the epigrammatist devotes most of his energy praising the deceased. Plato is here styled by his birth name, Aristocles, and not by the name by which he was commonly known. This name, aristocratic in origin, is in itself honorific: its two compounds, ἄριστος and κλέος, underline that the praise (κλέος) is due to the excellence (ἄριστος) of *this* man (οὗτος, v. 4).²⁰ Since Aristocles was also the name of Plato's grandfather, Simias has with great economy included in his praise a hint at Plato's family (γένος) as well.²¹

In addition, Simias praises Plato by naming his virtues in a priamel: prudence (*σωφροσύνη*) and justice (ἡθὸς δίκαιον) are foils to the cap, philosophy–wisdom (*σοφίη*)²² of the second couplet. It is in the sphere of prudence and justice that Plato surpasses mortals (*προφέρων θνητῶν*) and achieves the oxymoronic status of 'divine man' (ἀνὴρ θεῖος).²³ But it is his status as a philosopher that wins him universal praise (ἐκ πάντων... μέγαν ἔσχεν ἔπαινον) in unstinting quantity (*φθόνον οὐ φέρεται*).²⁴

And although Simias states in verse 3 that ἔπαινος is Plato's possession,²⁵ it is nonetheless true that, in the parlance of speech act theoreticians, the

physical nurture and training or education), *epitedeumata* (studies or pursuits, including choice of career and *bios*), and *praxeis* (exploits, often illustrative of cardinal virtues, on which see Race 1988, 44 with notes).

¹⁹ The Academy is fairly well represented in both inscribed and literary epigram: SGO 01/20/15, SGO 03/02/29, SGO 20/13/03; 'Pl.' AP 7.99 = FGE 10, Antagoras AP 7.103 = HE 1, Proclus AP 7.341, Leo Phil. AP 15.12, Joannes Barbocallus AP 327, among others, and now Posidipp. 89 A–B. On Call. AP 7.471 = HE 53, see pp. 302–4 in this chapter; on Agath. AP 11.354, see n. 78 in this chapter; on 'Speus.' AP 31 = FGE 1 (b) and AP 7.61 = FGE 1 (a), see n. 68 in this chapter.

²⁰ The pronoun οὗτος is also, of course, a commonplace of sepulchral epigram, which here not only points deictically to the grave but also underlines that the deceased is the wisest man. I owe this and several perceptive observations on this epigram to my editor, Maria Kanellou.

²¹ Lattimore (1942), 16–17 observes that a distinctive feature of Greek as opposed to Latin epigram is the marked lack of emphasis on the decedent's occupation. If so, funerary epigrams for philosophers are the exception to the rule, but also statesmen, soldiers, and poets receive their fair share.

²² There are numerous instances in Plato where *sophos* or *sophia* stands metonymically for philosophy as a whole; a most notable example is *Apology* 20d–4b. On the priamel, see Bundy (1962), 5 and Race (1982), 7–17. For the adversative conjunction δέ signalling the arrival of a (Bundian) 'cap', see Pi. O. 11.4 εἰ δὲ σὺν πόνῳ τις εὖ πράσσει ('But if by toil one should do well').

²³ Of course, this gives the *laudandus* a status equivalent to that of a Homeric hero (ἥρωες). Homeric heroes are semi-divine both by birth and through heroic achievement. Plato, too, achieves this status by birth (Aristocles, grandson of Aristocles, comes from good stock, we are to understand), but also through the kind of achievement peculiar to his occupation. The philosopher achieves semi-divine, heroic status not through martial valour (Homeric *arete*) but through goodness (another kind of *arete*) and reason, and we know from Plato's *Meno* (77b–78c) that this is no accident: in Plato's view, moral goodness and knowledge are co-determinative because a good person cannot knowingly do wrong.

²⁴ On φθόνος as an apologetic topic and a foil in the regulation of praise, see Bundy (1962, 29 n. 71; 1972, 54–7, 75–8, 89–92 with n. 111).

²⁵ Gnomic aorist ἔσχεν, see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 515.

epigrammatist's 'constative utterance' has 'performative value': that is, by acknowledging that Plato earned and earns universal praise for his philosophical wisdom, Simias also *confers* that praise.²⁶ The successful conferral of praise will redound to the credit of the epigrammatist as well. Epigram is a traditional vehicle for bestowing praise and an exceptionally powerful one in the hands of the right poet.²⁷

For a second illustration of the encomiastic technique in epigrams on philosophers, let us consider the following case study:

χαῖρε Νεοκλειδᾶν δίδυμον γένος, ὃν ὁ μὲν ὑμῶν
πατρίδα δουλοσύνας ῥύσαθ', ὁ δ' ἀφροσύνας.

(Men. AP 7.72 = FGE 1)

Farewell, double offspring of Neocles, of which one of you
saved his country from slavery, the other from ignorance.

Two famed Athenians, Themistocles and Epicurus, share the same patronymic and thus, in a way, a twin birth (δίδυμον γένος, v. 1). They can hardly have shared a tomb, but each of the two receives from Menander fresh praise (κλέος) owed to any child of such a father (νέος + κλέ- + -ιδ). Both are bidden farewell (χαῖρε, v. 1) and praised for their achievements, which are, once again, 'heroic'; the main verb ῥύσαθ' is Homeric (v. 2).²⁸ One *laudandus* is praised for liberating Athens²⁹ from a literal slavery;³⁰ the other for freeing the city from a metaphorical one, that of ignorance (ἀφροσύνας). Here the theme of the philosopher's virtue is given a litotic formulation: negated ἀφροσύνα amounts to σοφία. Unlike Simias AP 7.60, in Menander AP 7.72 an explicit marking of the epigram's encomiastic function is elided, apart from the etymology of Νεοκλειδᾶν, though such function is no less real for not being apparent.³¹

²⁶ On performatives, there is still no better formulation than that of the original, Austin (1962); in Pindar, see Bundy (1962); a noteworthy application in Homeric speeches is R. P. Martin (1989).

²⁷ Cf. 'Speus.' AP 7.61 = FGE 1 (a) and anon. AP 7.62, which for considerations of space I cannot discuss here.

²⁸ See LSJ s.v. ἐρύω I B 1 with Homeric examples for the usage, including *Il.* 5.344 and 13.327; cf. the *hapax* form at *Od.* 23.243–4: Ἥῳ δ' αὖτε | ῥύσατ' ἐπ' Ὑκεανῶ χρυσόθρονον ('And, furthermore, she [Athena] delayed golden-throned Dawn by Oceanus').

²⁹ Called in the poem merely πατρίδα (v. 2); by omitting explicit mention, Menander subtly elevates that famous city that produced those famous men.

³⁰ Epicurus is often praised as a liberator of the mind from negative emotion; see *Lucr.* 2.1–19, 3.1–30, 5.1–12.

³¹ It is worth noting that the praise is underlined through the *homoioteleuton* in δουλοσύνας and ἀφροσύνας. I thank Maria Kanellou for pointing this out to me.

2.2. Blame

Epigrammatists direct skoptic epigrams at philosophers as well.³² And while here I am examining the philosophical targets as objects of praise and blame, it will also become apparent that these contrasts in *AP* 11.158 are part of the epigrammatist's literary 'apology'.³³ In *AP* 11.158, Antipater of Thessalonica³⁴ demonstrates how 'blame poetry' inverts encomiastic topics and how encomium may be put in the service of skoptic epigram, even when blame is not ostensibly the primary goal when one reads the first half of the poem:

αἰάζει πῆρῃ τε καὶ Ἡράκλειον ἀρίστου
 βριθὺν Σινωπίτου Διογένης ῥόπαλον,
 καὶ τὸ χυδὴν ῥυπόεντι πίνῳ πεπαλαγμένον ἔσθος
 διπλάδιον, κρυερῶν ἀντίπαλον νιφάδων,
 ὅττι τεοῖς ὤμοισι μαιίνεται· ἦ γὰρ ὁ μὲν πον
 οὐράνιος, σὺ δ' ἔφυσ οὖν σποδιῇσι κύων.
 ἀλλὰ μέθες, μέθες ὅπλα τὰ μὴ σέθεν· ἄλλο λεόντων,
 ἄλλο γενειητῶν ἔργον ὄρωρε τράγων.
 (Antip. Thess. *AP* 11.158 = *GPh* 97)

5

The wallet laments as well as the heavy,
 Heracleian club of virtuous Diogenes of Sinope;
 and the double cloak for resisting the chilly clouds,
 all befouled with filth and dirt, laments too
 because it is polluted by your shoulders. Certainly, he is the dog
 of heaven, while you are the dog that lies in the ashes.
 So take off, take off the arms that are not yours. Lions have
 one function, bearded goats quite another.

Antipater of Thessalonica wrote at least two poems about the Cynic Diogenes, who is among the most well-represented figures in the epigrammatic corpus.³⁵

³² For a reflex of this impulse in Latin, see Henriksen (2012) on Mart. 9.27, esp. 115–16. Martial regularly attacks philosophers, principally Stoics and Cynics, in pursuit of his epigrammatic programme (see Mart. 1.24, 1.96, 2.36, 4.53, 6.56, 7.58, 9.47, and 12.42).

³³ For a theoretically sophisticated and sensitive survey of the practice of literary apology, see Bundy (1972) and Davis (1991). Bundy (1972), 47–8 takes the important step of defining 'apology' as anything and everything related to the poet's choices *qua* poet; Davis (1991) amplifies and extends Bundy's formulation to an impressive array of texts, focusing specifically, but not exclusively, on the 'generic' dimension of a poet's voice. Though Davis' contributions to criticism are generally thought to be confined to Horace and Aimé Césaire, his evidence base stretches from Homer to Derek Walcott and the literature of four languages.

³⁴ On the difficulty of separating Antipater of Sidon from Antipater of Thessalonica, see Argenti (2003). For the purposes of my study, the distinction is unimportant.

³⁵ Cf. Antip. Sid. in D.L. 7.29 = *HE* 35 (on Zeno) and *AP* 7.413 = *HE* 67 (on the Cynic Crates' wife, Hipparchia). Among the most recognizable are those conveniently collected by Clayman (2007), 497–9, including e.g. anon. *AP* 7.64, Antip. Thess. *AP* 7.65 = *GPh* 77, Honest. *AP* 7.66 = *GPh* 2, Arch. *AP* 7.68 = *GPh* 14. We may now add the *New Palladas* epigram 12 (p. 6, lines 10–20).

In this skoptic inflection of an epigram with sepulchral undertones,³⁶ praise, if included at all, is a foil to blame, and this demonstrates the complementarity of the two functions. In verses 1–4, Antipater catalogues the iconic possessions of Diogenes and his followers: a wallet, a staff, and a double cloak. In other examples, the tokens (here called *ὄπλα*, v. 7) are included so as to identify and praise the owner for his earthy humility,³⁷ but here something is off: the tokens lament (*αἰάζει*, v. 1) because, as we learn in verse 5, they belong to a poseur Cynic.

The basis for Antipater's invective is to measure the distance between the true and the false Cynic vertically, marking the *upper* limit with the praise of the heavenly Diogenes and the *lower* limit with a Cynic covered in the dirt, where apparently he belongs.³⁸ The false Cynic is metonymically all too close to the earth: he is 'filthy' (*ῥυπόεντι πίνω* v. 3, *μυαίνεται* v. 5, *σποδιῇσι* v. 6). On the one hand, Diogenes' canine humility is sublime (*οὐράνιος*, v. 6);³⁹ the poseur, on the other hand, is gross: just another dog in an ash heap (*σὺ δ' ἔφρυς . . . σποδιῇσι κύων*, v. 6). A second measure of the distance between the two comes in the association of Diogenes with Heracles:⁴⁰ the Cynic philosopher carries a staff; but, in an effort to exceed people's expectations, the Cynic poseur carries a veritable club of Heracles. In the concluding lines, Antipater urges the faux Cynic to disrobe (*μέθες, μέθες*, v. 7), not only because he is not worthy of the insignia—they belong to someone else (*ὄπλα τὰ μὴ σέθεν*, v. 7)—but also because the animal he most resembles is not so much a 'heavenly' dog as a shaggy goat; certainly not a (Heracleian) lion (vv. 7–8). Here Antipater praises Diogenes in order to amplify the blame of the would-be Cynic by giving it dimension.

Antipater of Thessalonica⁴¹ employs similar techniques in yet another sepulchral epigram, though this time encomiastic, AP 7.65, which conveniently provides a transition to the next aspect of my study.

Διογένης τόδε σῆμα, σοφοῦ κυνὸς ὅς ποτε θυμῷ
 ἄρσενι γυμνήτην ἐξεπώνει βίοτον,
 ᾧ μία τις πήρα, μία διπλοῖς, εἷς ἅμ' ἐφοίτα
 σκίπων, αὐτάρκους ὄπλα σαοφροσύνας.
 ἀλλὰ τάφου τοῦδ' ἐκτὸς ἴτ', ἄφρονες, ὥς ὁ Σινωπεὺς
 ἐχθαίρει φαῦλον πάντα καὶ εἰν Αἶδην.

(Antip. Thess. AP 7.65 = GPh 77)

5

³⁶ Gow and Page (1968), 2: 98 on v. 1 f. (= 621 ff.).

³⁷ See *ibid.*, 2: 80 on v. 3 f. (= 499 f.) for examples, including e.g. Honest. AP 7.66.

³⁸ This element of anti-philosophical polemic is already evident in Aristophanes' *Clouds*; see Owen (1983).

³⁹ See Gow and Page (1968), 2: 98, who cite Cercidas CA fr. 1 on Diogenes' name (*οὐράνιος τε κύων*); cf. Simias AP 7.60.2 = HE 6.2 (*ἀνὴρ θεῖος*). Gow and Page's idea that in v. 6 (= 626) Cercidas' heavenly, philosophical dog should be kept separate from the 'hound of the skies', i.e. Sirius, the Dog Star seems unmotivated.

⁴⁰ On this topic, see López Cruces (2013).

⁴¹ For the issue of his identity, see n. 34 in this chapter.

This is the tomb of Diogenes, a philosopher of the Cynic variety, who
 once with manly courage laboured through a virtually naked life,
 who went about with just a wallet, a double cloak, and a staff
 to boot, defensive weapons of self-sufficient wisdom.
 So leave this tomb, you without philosophy, since the man of Sinope
 despises every man of small worth, even in Hades.

Antipater identifies immediately the *laudandus* by name. As in Menander AP 7.72.1 (*Νεοκλείς*), the etymology of the *laudandus*' name, Diogenes, is not, I contend, entirely irrelevant, since Zeus (< Διο-), whose offspring is Diogenes (-γενής), occupies an upper vertical extreme. Appropriately, the tomb's recipient is a philosopher (σοφός, v. 1)⁴² who occupies an elevated position in relation to the rest of humanity.⁴³ The contrast upon which the epigram is based follows immediately: Diogenes is not your typical philosopher (σοφός) but a σοφὸς κύων (σοφοῦ κυνός, v. 1)⁴⁴ whose canine association, along with the attendant emblems of his ascetic simplicity (only a wallet, a cloak, and a club), might have led one to the wrong conclusion, namely that such a man was not in fact superior to mankind but was rather 'of small worth' (φαῦλος, v. 6). From the perspective of encomiastic technique, the marked antithesis between 'high' and 'low', or 'worthy' and 'cheap', is the primary mechanism of Antipater's praise of Diogenes. The philosopher *surpasses* humanity even if the outward trappings of his life do not match that superiority. That the divine Diogenes could do so even from the very depths of all reality (καὶ εἰν Αἰδῇ, v. 6) amplifies the apparent contradiction. Mention of the particulars of philosophical Cynicism, however—the disambiguating term κύων, the various ὄπλα, the Cynic virtue par excellence, αὐτάρκεια—should not distract the reader from a key point: in dismissing the immoderate and ignorant (ἄφρονες) passers-by from Diogenes' tomb—ἀλλὰ τάφου τοῦδ' ἐκτὸς ἔτ', ἄφρονες (v. 5)—the owner of the epigrammatic voice (perhaps the tomb itself) banishes non-Cynics and non-philosophers alike.⁴⁵ Ἀφρονες describes not only those who dare to own more than a Cynic but, I contend, all who have not the sense to establish themselves as persons of true worth (cf. φαῦλον, v. 6), that is, all who are not philosophers.

In my four case studies thus far, philosophers are praised or blamed in accordance with the standard topics available for the purpose.⁴⁶ Epigrammatic

⁴² As usual, Gow and Page (1968), 2: 80 rightly note the polar opposition between σοφός and φαῦλος in v. 6 (= 502). See also *LSJ* s.v. φαῦλος in 'opp. σοφός', citing E. *Hipp.* 989, *Ph.* 496, *Ion* 834, and *Ba.* 431; *Pl. Smp.* 174c and *Alc.* 1.129a.

⁴³ See pp. 302–4 with notes, especially nn. 69 and 71.

⁴⁴ On the phrase as a virtual *terminus technicus*, see Gow and Page (1968), 2: 79 on v. 1 (= 497).

⁴⁵ Gow and Page (1968), 2: 80 gloss ἄφρονες in verse 5 (= 501) as οἱ μὴ σωφρονούντες (and cite Xen. *Cyn.* 3.1.17). In this chapter I contend that possession of individual virtues can stand synecdochically for adherence to a philosophical school writ large.

⁴⁶ For a bibliographical survey of encomiastic topics, see Race (1988), 205; for the topics themselves, see the invaluable study of hymnal topoi in Miller (1986), 1–9.

laudators (and detractors) mark a vertical gap between the philosopher ‘hero’ and everything else. This distance is often achieved by underlining the virtue that matters most for a philosopher, namely σοφία (σωφροσύνη or similar concepts). The case studies also show that, in a ‘philosophical’ epigram, the specific philosophical sect and content is less important than the way philosophers are regarded in general; regardless of their school or creed, philosophers occupy a position relatively elevated and proximate to the divine.

3. THE QUARREL

In this opening critical gesture, I have tried to demonstrate how various epigrammatists of different eras adapted standard encomiastic methods in ‘philosophical’ epigram. It is worth noting that in doing so epigrammatists stake a claim for their genre as supremely adequate to the task of rendering praise, dispensing blame, and generally passing definitive judgement. We may now turn to a key feature in this type of literary epigram, namely the issue of generic identity. In the small subset of epigrams that follows, epigrammatists champion epigram (and, I argue, poetry in general) as a discursive medium, and also disavow philosophy.⁴⁷

3.1. Disavowing Philosophy

In an epigram of clear programmatic intent, Posidippus disavows philosophy, in this case Stoic, in favour of sympotic–erotic epigram:

Κεκροπί, ῥαῖνε, λάγυνε, πολύδροσον ἱκμάδα Βάκχου,
 ῥαῖνε· δροσιζέσθω συμβολικὴ πρόποσις.
 σιγάσθω Ζήνων ὁ σοφὸς κύκνος, ἃ τε Κλεάνθους
 μοῦσα, μέλοι δ’ ἡμῖν ὁ γλυκύπικρος Ἔρως.

(Posidipp. AP 5.134 = HE 1 = 123 A–B)

Cecropean jug, pour out the dewy moisture of Bacchus,
 pour it out: let a libation be sprinkled as my pledge.
 Let Zeno, the wise swan, be silent, and Cleanthes’
 Muse, may our theme be Eros the bittersweet.

⁴⁷ On the interplay of genres, see Conte (1986). My debt to Davis (1991) is patent passim; Davis (2012) is a powerful study of Vergilian bucolic as a therapeutic instrument of Epicurean philosophy.

In the first couplet, Posidippus urges the Attic wine jug to pour out a dewy libation (πολύδροσον v. 1; δροσιζέσθω v. 2).⁴⁸ The libation is a pact, a pledge (συμβολικὴ πρόποσις, v. 2), but to which god? For an answer to that, we read on. Zeno, the philosophical swan (ὁ σοφὸς κύκνος, v. 3), and Cleanthes' Muse⁴⁹ must remain quiet, their sound replaced by the irrational, discordant, bittersweet Eros (ὁ γλυκύπικρος Ἔρως, v. 4). Posidippus signals his shift of allegiance from philosophical content by incorporating an emblem from that icon of erotic lyric, Sappho (fr. 130.1–2 L–P): Ἐρῶς δηῦτε μ' ὁ λυσιμέλης δόνει | γλυκύπικρον ἀμάχανον ὄρπετον ('Once again Eros the limb-loosener shakes me, a bittersweet, irresistible creature'). In this *recusatio*, philosophy is praised (acknowledged through σοφός, v. 3) only to give way to a *laudandus* who can only be trouble (γλυκύπικρος, v. 4). Indeed, consistent with the terms of the quarrel between poetry and philosophy,⁵⁰ Posidippean sympotic–erotic epigram revels in the charge that it is ecstatic and irrational.⁵¹

3.2. Simple Minds

Thus far epigrammatists have both praised and blamed philosophers, and epigram is held out as an appropriate generic vehicle for those functions. Automedon *AP* 11.50 serves as a transition to the next set of poems; for, in my

⁴⁸ Of course, the dew has an aesthetic dimension as well; see Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.33–4 Pf. and Harder (2012) ad loc.

⁴⁹ Surely philosophy can be written in poetic metre, as nearly all Presocratic philosophy was and Lucretius' *De rerum natura* was subsequently. In this poem, Posidippus plays (real, in this case, erotic) poetry against philosophy of any kind, prose or poetry. See the following note for my understanding of the dialectical process in literary apology.

⁵⁰ On the *recusatio*, see Davis (1991), 11–77, esp. 28–30. Significantly, Davis redefines the *recusatio* as a 'generic disavowal' to account for the more complex dialectical exchange taking place in the rhetorical gesture. It is important to note that I use these terms broadly, as do our poets, to mark a distinction that is, indeed, grounded in historical fact, but whose semantic purpose is primarily rhetorical, i.e. the 'other' is held up as a 'foil' to the chosen genre. For the *neikos* ('strife') between poetry and philosophy, see Pl. *R.* 607b5–6 and Clay (2000), 129–41.

⁵¹ In a similar way, in Posidipp. *AP* 12.120 = *HE* 7 = 138 A–B, the poet declares himself well armed and ready for a fight against Eros, which he will concede if drunk; but he will marshal (Stoic) philosophical reasoning (λογισμὸν, v. 4) against the god if sober. Posidippus here adapts Anacreon fr. 396 L–P: φέρ' ὕδωρ, φέρ' οἶνον, ὦ παῖ, φέρε <δ> ἀνθεμόεντας ἡμῖν | στεφάνους· ἔνεικον, ὥς δὴ πρὸς Ἐρωτα πυκταλίζω ('Bring water, bring wine, boy, and bring me flowering garlands: make them ready so I may finally duke it out with Eros'). Note that in Posidipp. *AP* 5.134 = *HE* 1 = 123 A–B, too, the citation of a Lesbian paradigm is a crucial marker of generic identity vis-à-vis a philosophical other. In an erotic–sympotic epigram, however, the point of the fight against Eros is *to lose*; see Erler (2010). Clayman (2007), 515–16 makes a similar argument about Phld. *AP* 11.41 = *GPh* 17, where philosophy marks a limit to the madness of erotic epigram. On Meleager's sequence *AP* 5.176–80 on Eros, see Gutzwiller's chapter in this volume; on ecphrastic epigrams on Eros composed by Palladas, see Bing's chapter in this volume.

view, although the philosopher Epicurus is invoked by name, the poet's enemy is not Epicureanism per se but philosophy as a whole.

εὐδαίμων πρῶτον μὲν ὁ μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλων,
 εἶτα δ' ὁ μὴ γήμας, τὸ τρίτον ὅστις ἄπαις.
 ἦν δὲ μανεῖς γήμη τις, ἔχει χάριν, ἦν κατορύξῃ
 εὐθὺς τὴν γαμετὴν προῖκα λαβὼν μεγάλην.
 ταῦτ' εἰδὼς σοφὸς ἴσθι· μάτην δ' Ἐπίκουρον ἔασον
 ποῦ τὸ κενὸν ζητεῖν καὶ τίνες αἱ μονάδες.

5

(Autom. AP 11.50 = GPh 4)

Happy is he, in the first place, who owes nothing to anyone,
 next the one who has not been married, third whoever is without child.
 If in a fit of insanity one chooses to marry, he is grateful if he buries
 his wife immediately after taking possession of a large dowry.
 Knowing this, be wise: and let Epicurus vainly
 seek where void is and what atoms are.

In verses 1–4, Automedon registers a set of homespun, misogynistic principles appropriate to the skoptic subgenre.⁵² In the final couplet he reappropriates the philosopher's virtue (i.e. knowledge) and returns it to epigram: the addressee is urged to accept knowledge (ταῦτ' εἰδὼς, v. 5) that is available to everyone and to show himself to be truly wise (σοφὸς ἴσθι, v. 5). The wisdom of the epigrammatist beats the useless questioning of Epicurus into emptiness and 'monads' (vv. 5–6). Epicurean concepts of void (τὸ κενόν) and atoms (αἱ μονάδες) are cited, but in the hands of Automedon they also serve as an indictment.⁵³ This epistemological humility reveals itself in fact to be a kind of intellectual superiority, because the epigrammatist—the everyman—sees things 'as they truly are'.

Let us now turn our attention to two poems on Aristotle—the first certain, the second suspected—that merit to be inspected together. In both epigrams, the philosopher is isolated for mockery either because he fails to live up to a philosopher's lofty ideals (Theocritus of Chios *FGE* 1)⁵⁴ or because those lofty ideals have prevented an appreciation of things that are perhaps better left unexplained (Antiphilus AP 9.73). I include these poems in this section since part of the epigrammatist's authority is derived from his ability to see things more clearly than a philosopher, who owing either to his circumstances or to his blinding hyperintellection fails to see the world 'as it really is'.

⁵² Compare the parody of the Stoic philosopher's logic chopping in vv. 1–4 of Call. AP 12.118 = *HE* 8, which gives way to the erotic inflection of Callimachean epigram. See Livingstone (2010), 74–6 esp. n. 54.

⁵³ Very similar in argumentation is Phan. AP 6.307 = *HE* 7, where the subject, Eugathes of Lapithe (Thessaly?), *unwisely* quits his barbering business to become a reader in Epicurus' Garden (κηπολόγος, v. 6) and would have died of starvation had he not thought better of it. See Gow and Page (1965), 2: 473–5.

⁵⁴ Preserved by Aristocles in Eus. *PE* 15.2, 793^a.

For instance, at first glance, the epigram composed by Theocritus of Chios seems to renounce Aristotle and his Lyceum for Plato's Academy; but the poem merits closer inspection.

Ἑρμίου εὐνούχου τε καὶ Εὐβούλου τόδε δούλου
σῆμα κενὸν κενόφρων τεύξεν Ἀριστοτέλης,
ὃς γαστρὸς τιμῶν ἄνομον φύσιν εἴλετο ναίειν
ἀντ' Ἀκαδημείας βορβόρου ἐν προχοαῖς.
(Theoc. of Chios FGE 1)

For Hermias, Eubulus' eunuch and slave,
empty-headed Aristotle built this empty tomb,
who honoured the lawless nature of his belly by choosing to reside
by the outpourings of filth instead of the Academy.⁵⁵

Unlike the implicitly intelligent and knowing epigrammatist, Aristotle is in fact empty-headed (κενόφρων, v. 2); and, since like produces like—as had Epicurus in AP 11.50.6—Aristotle has constructed something that is empty as well (σῆμα κενόν, v. 2). In choosing (εἴλετο,⁵⁶ v. 3) to honour his father-in-law, Hermias,⁵⁷ with this extravagant praise in the form of a tomb,⁵⁸ Aristotle has debased himself and fallen short of the dignity of his calling. Hermias is identified as both 'eunuch' and 'slave'—bad enough in themselves—but Aristotle's attachment to such a man is finally characterized as a decision to reside 'amid the outpourings of filth' (βορβόρου ἐν προχοαῖς, v. 4). David Runia cites Plato's *Republic* 533c7–d2 (ἐν βορβόρῳ βαρβαρικῶ τινι, 'in some kind of barbarian bog') and rightly observes the chauvinistically Hellenic association of βόρβορος with barbarism. It is not irrelevant that, as Runia argues, in this passage of the *Republic* in particular, Socrates maintains that the dialectical method must liberate the unphilosophical soul, which is obscured 'in barbaric filth'. For Aristotle to choose to reside among such 'outpourings of filth' is to

⁵⁵ See Düring (1957), 277, which is cited and expanded in Runia (1986), 532–4. I print the text of Runia (1986), 531, who follows a line of thinking expressed in Jacobs (6.374), understanding βόρβορος as 'mud, filth' rather than Βόρβορος, a river in Macedonia. See Page (1981), 94–5 for a good apparatus and discussion of the interpretative possibilities, especially on vv. 3–4 (= 355–6): 'There must, however, have been a reason for using the river Borboros as a symbol for Macedonia, and there is great probability in Jacobs' opinion that the phrase alludes at the same time to the charge of impiety.' Page prints Βόρβορος.

⁵⁶ In my view, the reference to choice (εἴλετο, v. 3) is an intentional reference to a key term in Aristotle's virtue ethics, προαίρεσις, on which see EN 3.2 and 6.2. For the dialectical technique of assimilating disavowed material, see Davis (1991), chapter 1 (on 'modes of assimilation').

⁵⁷ Tyrant of Atarneus and adoptive father of his niece, Pythias, and therefore father-in-law of Aristotle; also recipient of Plato's sixth epistle and supposed to have written on the immortality of the soul; see OCD s.v. Aristotle.

⁵⁸ Aristotle had been prosecuted, we are told, on a charge of asebeia ('impiety') for praising Hermias as immortal; see D.L. 5.5 (from Diogenes' *Life of Aristotle*) = FGE 1 and PMG 842.18; citations in Page (1981), 93.

pull away not just from the Academy but from philosophy in general.⁵⁹ And in that he does honour to his basest human nature: he pays homage to the law (φύσις) of a lawless, irrational desire (γαστρος τιμων ανομον φύσιν, v. 3).⁶⁰ Theocritus mocks what he views as Aristotle's hypocrisy by dragging him into the mud, though he does so not because he espouses a superior philosophy but because, I argue, he feigned a privileged position beyond the ambit of the everyday and ordinary.⁶¹

In AP 9.73, Antiphilus probably adverts to the legend that Aristotle committed suicide in despair, for not being able to solve the riddle of the Euripus' tidal fluctuations.⁶²

Εὐβοϊκοῦ κόλποιο παλινδίνητε θάλασσα,
 πλαγκτὸν ὕδωρ ἰδίους ρεύμασιν ἀντίπαλον,
 ἡελίῳ κῆν νυκτὶ τεταγμένον ἐς τρίς, ἅπιστε,
 ναυσὶν ὅσον πέμπεις χεῦμα δανειζόμενον·
 θαῦμα βίου, θαμβῶ σε τὸ μυρίον, οὐδὲ ματεύω
 σὴν στάσιν· ἀρρήτῳ ταῦτα μέμηλε φύσει.
 (Antiphil. AP 9.73 = GPh 5)

5

O vacillating sea of the Euboean gulf,
 a water wandering in opposition to your own flows,
 how great a rush of water you send on loan to ships, directing it yourself
 three times by day, three times at night, inconstant.
 A true wonder of life, I am infinitely amazed at you, but I do not search out
 the causes of your disorder: such things are the province of ineffable⁶³ Nature.

Both the poet and the philosopher may proceed by wonder (θαῦμα βίου and θαμβῶ σε τὸ μυρίον, v. 5).⁶⁴ However, whereas the philosopher looks at something as unpredictable as the sea and sees a problem to be solved, something to be reduced to a formula and rules, the epigrammatic poet renounces investigation (οὐδὲ ματεύω | σὴν στάσιν, vv. 5–6), permitting nature to remain awesome and ineffable (ἀρρήτῳ ... φύσει, v. 6).

⁵⁹ Runia (1986), 53–4. Cf. Clayman (2007), 500–1.

⁶⁰ Here the reference to γαστήρ (v. 3) is not unlike that at Hes. *Th.* 26–8, where the relationship between our basic needs (γαστερες οἶον) and higher aspirations (ἔδμεν) is formulated paradigmatically.

⁶¹ Runia (1986), 53: 'Theocritus himself was no Platonist. Just like Theopompus, he stood in the Isocratean tradition and would not have sung the Academy's praises without an ulterior motive. If we look beyond the cruder aspects of its invective, the epigram attacks Aristotle on his own terms. He might pontificate at great length on the βίος φιλόσοφος in works like the *Protrepticus* and the *Eudemus*, but his actions by no means match his words.' Relevant, in my view, is not just the Aristotelian protreptic to philosophy but also the mechanics of that philosophy.

⁶² See Gow and Page (1968), 2: 119, who cite Philippon *RE* 6.1281–5 on vv. 5–6 (= 813–14).

⁶³ *LSJ* s.v. ἄρρητος, -ον, with a reference to Pl. *Sph.* 238c.

⁶⁴ On philosophical wonder (θαῦμα), see Pl. *Th.* 155d; Arist. *Metaph.* 982b; Kanaan (2011); on poetic wonder, see Bundy (1962), 13 n. 36; Miller (1986), 55–6, 60.

4. IN LIEU OF AN EPILOGUE: PLATO'S ON THE SOUL

In the course of this study, I have tried to demonstrate how skilled epigrammatists have adapted the standard encomiastic topics—and their skoptic inversions—to fit philosophers. I have also endeavoured to show how epigrammatists use philosophy and philosophers as a foil to their own epigrammatic genre and, occasionally, allow epigram to speak for poetry as a whole. In the previous section philosophy was disavowed as an expression not of Pyrrhonian scepticism but of an ordinary scepticism about large claims, a scepticism that belongs to a strand of epigrammatic humility.⁶⁵ By epigrammatic humility I mean that, by and large, epigrammatic poets tend to use philosophy as a relatively elevated foil to their own simpler, smaller, and (disingenuously) inferior undertaking. To this point, my method has been synchronic: it has consisted of reading literary epigrams of different periods to support the thesis that the topics are relatively consistent in terms of their encomiastic (or skoptic) procedures. As a concluding gesture, I want to re-examine Callimachus AP 7.471.⁶⁶

The epigram is a literary epitaph on the subject of Cleombrotus the Ambracian:

εἵπας “Ἥλιε, χαῖρε’, Κλεόμβροτος Ὠμβρακιώτης
ῆλατ’ ἀφ’ ὑψηλοῦ τείχεος εἰς Αἴδην,
ἄξιον οὐδέν ἰδὼν θανάτου κακόν, ἀλλὰ Πλάτωνος
ἐν τὸ περὶ ψυχῆς γράμμ’ ἀναλεξάμενος.
(Call. AP 7.471 = HE 53)

After saying, ‘farewell, sun’, Cleombrotus the Ambracian
leapt from a high wall to Hades,
and not because he saw any misfortune worthy of death,
but merely because he had perused a single dialogue of Plato about the soul.

In verses 1–2 Cleombrotus is hailed by name and *polis*, and the topic of the ‘cause’ of death is extremely prominent.⁶⁷ Also important is Callimachus’ possible variation of the standard epitaphic topic of *soma–psyche* (cf. the vertical distance between mortals and gods or heroes), which was also the structuring motif of Plato’s grave epitaph.⁶⁸ That Callimachus was aware of

⁶⁵ On Vergil’s alignment of aesthetic (generic) practice and moral or ‘philosophical’ disposition in the *genus tenue* (e.g. bucolic), in contrast with the alignment of ‘loftier dispositions’ in the *genus grande* (e.g. epic, tragedy, but also philosophy), see Romero (1999). On the same practice in Horatian lyric, see Davis (1991).

⁶⁶ On this epigram, see Sinko (1905); S. A. White (1994); G. D. Williams (1995); Garulli (2007); Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 1–83. Acosta-Hughes and Stephens see a sustained engagement between Callimachus and Plato on the subject of poetry and philosophy. On Callimachus’ relationship to inscribed epigram, see Meyer (2005).

⁶⁷ Cf. Lattimore (1942), 142–58.

⁶⁸ See ‘Speus.’ AP 7.61.1–2 = FGE 1.1–2 (a): γαῖα μὲν ἐν κόλποις κρύπτει τόδε σῶμα Πλάτωνος, | ψυχὴ δ’ ἀθάνατον τάξιν ἔχει μακάρων (‘The earth conceals this body in her folds, but the soul keeps her immortal position among the blessed’); ‘Speus.’ AP 1 = FGE 1 (b): σῶμα μὲν ἐν

this trope is at least probable.⁶⁹ Callimachus singles out the *laudandus*, Cleombrotus the Ambracian, who, as Stephen White has persuasively argued, is drawn from Plato's *Phaedo* (59c);⁷⁰ Cleombrotus had been among those absent from the episode of Socrates' death in prison and, as we shall see, his appearance here seems pointed.

Knowledge of the vertical dimension of praise and blame is relevant here: Cleombrotus bids farewell to the sun, to which he is proximate atop a lofty wall (ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ τείχεος, v. 2), while leaping to his death (εἰς Αἴδην, v. 2). For a philosopher, this elevated vantage point is, typically, a secure place from which to view the struggles of humanity. However, Cleombrotus leaps from it.⁷¹ The punning etymology of his name is also relevant: Cleombrotus achieves immortal glory (κλέος and ἄμβροτος) through the Callimachean epigram, but he earns it by testing out his mortality (κλέος and βροτός). Ironically, in an effort to ascend to the ranks of philosophy—to 'put his money where his mouth is', as they say—he literally leaps from his elevated position to death. This leap is perhaps not quite unanticipated, given that Cleombrotus comes from Ambracia, home of the White Rock of Leucas, where lovers leapt to find metaphorical death and rebirth.⁷² In Callimachus' account, Cleombrotus' leap is thus a parody in itself.

What about the cause? Cleombrotus' decision (vv. 3–4) was not grounded in a particularly negative conclusion about the nature of this life (ἄξιον οὐδὲν ἰδὼν θανάτου κακόν, v. 3) but was based on the very limited, cursory⁷³ reading of a single dialogue of Plato, in which Socrates argues for the immortality of the soul: the *Phaedo* (known in antiquity as *Περὶ ψυχῆς*, *On the Soul*).⁷⁴

In funerary epigrams in verse from Greco-Roman antiquity, attitudes towards the afterlife range from belief to scepticism.⁷⁵ In terms of the surviving

κόλποις κατέχει τόδε γαῖα Πλάτωνος, | ψυχὴ δ' ἰσόθεον τάξιν ἔχει μακάρων ('The earth possesses in her folds this body of Plato, but his soul keeps a godlike position among the blessed'). Also relevant is anon. AP 7.62.3–4: ψυχῆς εἰμὶ Πλάτωνος ἀποπταμένης ἐς Ὀλυμπον | εἰκὼν σώμα δὲ γῆ γηγενὲς Ἀθῆς ἔχει ('I am the likeness of Plato's soul flown off to Olympus; but Attic earth holds my earth-born body').

⁶⁹ On the complementary terms *soma* and *psyche* in Greek verse epigram, see Page (1981), 306; Tueller in this volume; and n. 68 in this chapter.

⁷⁰ S. A. White (1994); *contra* G. D. Williams (1995). On the *Phaedo* as a dialogue about the fate of the soul, see anon. AP 9.358 (Plato's dialogue is speaking): εἴ με Πλάτων οὐ γράψε, δύο γέγονον Πλάτωνα. | Σωκρατικῶν δάρων ἄνθεα πάντα φέρω. | ἀλλὰ νόθον με ἐτέλεσε Παναίτιος. ὅς ῥ' ἐτέλεσε | καὶ ψυχὴν θνητὴν, καὶ μὲ νόθον τελέσει ('If Plato did not write me, there were two Platos. I bear all the blooms of the Socratic dialogues. But Panaetius made me out to be spurious. Whoever reckoned the soul (to be) mortal, will also reckon me spurious').

⁷¹ Lucr. 2.1–19 and Bailey (1947) ad loc.

⁷² That Cleombrotus hails from Ambracia is therefore probably relevant: he re-creates the lover's leap with false hope. On the White Rock of Leucas, see Nagy (1992), 223–62.

⁷³ On ἀναλεξάμενος as 'skimming', see Gow and Page (1965), 2: 205; *contra* G. D. Williams (1995), 159–60.

⁷⁴ See Gow and Page (1965), 2: 204. On the fatal mistake of being *unius libri lector*, see Garulli (2007).

⁷⁵ The following account is largely based on Fantuzzi (2004), 322–8, esp. nn. 140–4. In Italy and other places, and in imperial times, *non fui, fui, non sum, non curo* ('I wasn't, I was, I am not

evidence, the more common view—belief—is registered in the earliest literature (e.g. the *Odyssey*), but not found in epigram until the fourth century BCE; the less common view—scepticism—does not emerge until the fifth century BCE in literature (e.g. in Euripides) and does not appear convincingly until the third century CE.⁷⁶ In *AP* 7.471, Callimachus arrogates the epigrammatic voice to reject the philosopher's 'lofty' (ὕψηλοῦ, v. 2) arguments about the nature of the soul.⁷⁷ Callimachus thus aligns himself with a relatively unorthodox, sceptical view about the fate of the soul.⁷⁸ The grandeur of philosophy is rejected for the diminutive, intuitive logic of epigram.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to my fellow conference attendees, Valentina Garulli and Mike Tueller, who were generous with ideas and resources, and to Maria Kanellou, who was generous to a fault about everything. I wish to thank Francesco Valerio for an advance copy of his critical edition of Agathias. Without Carla Bailey of the Simpson Library at the University of Mary Washington, none of us here could write anything; without the peerless resources of the Center for Hellenic Studies of Harvard University, this chapter would be far poorer. Many thanks are due to Angela Pitts for taking time to improve an earlier draft and for giving one last, thorough critique of the chapter before its completion, and to Brett Evans, who provided invaluable research assistance at the eleventh hour. Ultimate thanks are due to my precious and ever cheerful Elizabeth.

longer, (and) I don't care') is commonly found, which Lattimore thinks may be Epicurean in origin; see Lattimore (1942), 83–5 n. 469.

⁷⁶ Again, see Lattimore (1942). How may we account for this disparity? To a degree, it depends on one's view of the relationship between literature and ordinary people. Perhaps the Homeric view was normative until avant-garde intellectuals like the Presocratics and those influenced by them, such as Euripides, started floating alternative views, provoking an inscriptional reaction in the fourth century BCE restating the Homeric norm. The relatively late appearance of eschatological scepticism in inscriptions could be attributed in part to a conservative 'pagan' reaction to the rise of religions such as Christianity.

⁷⁷ On eschatology in Callimachus, see Fantuzzi (2004), 322–8. Pythagoras is an obvious and well-represented example, his eschatology being so pronouncedly different from the ideas of the age. In inscribed verse epigram, see e.g. *SGO* 03/02/29, 04/24/02, and 08/01/35; in literary epigram, see e.g. anon. *AP* 7.93, 7.119–22; *API* 325–6; *New Palladas* epigram 2 (p. 6, lines 10–20). See S. A. White (1994) on Cyrenaics.

⁷⁸ A brilliant recapitulation of Call. *AP* 7.471 = *HE* 53 from the Byzantine era, and similarly sceptical of philosophy, is Agath. *AP* 11.354, on which see Viansino (1967), 150–3; G. D. Williams (1995), 167–9; Valerio (2014), 92–3.

Part 6

Words and Images

Greek Skoptic Epigram, Ecphrasis, and the Visual Arts

Lucia Floridi

1. INTRODUCTION

Many skoptic epigrams of the *Greek Anthology* play with the conventions of ecphrastic epigrams,¹ according to a tradition that was fully developed in the Neronian era² but inscribed in the history of the genre from its very beginning. When epigram started to become independent of the object upon which it was inscribed and to acquire a pure ‘literary’ status—and, as a consequence, to expand its limits in order to include elements from other literary traditions—it explored the potentialities of (sub)genre crossing, playing with its own language and themes so as to produce jocular reassessments and parodies of traditional inscriptional forms. Asclepiades, for instance, plays with generic ambiguity by creating the expectation of an epitaph, or of a dedication, in erotic or playful poems, jocularly engaging with ‘serious’ eulogistic epigram types;³ Callimachus and other Hellenistic poets ironically reflect on the conventions of inscriptional epigram and on their artificiality.⁴ Thus epigram,

¹ There has been much discussion on the use of the labels ‘ecphrasis’ and ‘ecphrastic epigram’ for epigrams on works of art, since these do not offer a full rhetorical description of an object as formulated in imperial and late antique *progymnasmata*. Here I retain these terms, as most scholars do, to designate epigrams that have as their subject works of art but do not provide an actual description of them. See discussions by Lauxtermann (1998), 326–9; L. Rossi (2001), 15–16; Männlein-Robert (2007a, 251–2); Männlein-Robert (2007b), 37–8; and Squire (2010b), 592–3 n. 15. More information on the ancient definition of ecphrasis follows at the end of this chapter.

² For the reuse of topoi of traditional epigrammatic subgenres by poets who, for the first time, dealt almost exclusively with the skoptic type of epigram, see Floridi (2010). For the development of Greek skoptic epigram, see Blomqvist (1998); Floridi (2014a), 9–14; on imperial skoptic epigram, cf. Nisbet (2003). The recently published Vienna Epigrams Papyrus, *G 40611* (Parsons, Maehler, and Maltomini 2015), enables us to understand better the diffusion of the skoptic typology in the Hellenistic era; see Floridi and Maltomini (2016).

³ Sens (2011), xxxiv–xlii.

⁴ Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 283–338.

originally conceived of as belonging to the genre of eulogy, gradually started to enrich its range of subjects with playful themes, which traditionally pertained to other genres, such as iambus and comedy,⁵ until it paradoxically became the genre par excellence of mockery and abuse.

The aim of this chapter is to analyse some of the ways in which skoptic epigram engages with the ecphrastic tradition. I have dealt elsewhere with skoptic epigrams that parody specific ecphrastic poems or adopt and manipulate the structure of ecphrastic epigrams in various non-ecphrastic contexts.⁶ Here I concentrate mostly on different cases of reappropriation of ecphrasis by various skoptic authors. I first examine examples of what can be called a 'thematic reversal', where the traditional ecphrastic eulogy of artists or artefacts is replaced by satire. I then move on to the analysis of skoptic poems that toy with ecphrastic conventions in a more nuanced way, and I argue that, in spite of their jocular character, they elicit the same kind of response prompted by an actual ecphrastic epigram, since they implicitly request their audience to supplement the poet's words with images of specific works of art.

Although many of the epigrams analysed are anonymous and thus cannot be dated with any certainty, they all probably come from the first centuries of the imperial age, the heyday of skoptic epigram. They thus testify to the features that skoptic epigram had acquired by the time it had fully developed as a subgenre, acting as a counterpart of 'serious' epigrammatic forms but never forgetting its origins and strong links with the epigrammatic tradition.

2. THEMATIC REVERSAL: SATIRE OF BAD ARTISTS AND UGLY PEOPLE

Ecphrastic epigrams usually celebrate (a) the artist's skilfulness or (b) the beauty, identified with the lifelikeness, of the artefact (and thus, indirectly, of the object or person portrayed).⁷ Skoptic epigrams based on the parody of the ecphrastic typology, then, most obviously target (a) bad artists and (b) ugly people.

⁵ Just as erotic epigrams borrowed narrative and thematic elements from other genres, especially lyric and elegiac poetry; on this topic, see Sens (2011), xlii–xlvi. For the relationship between epigram and elegy, see Gentili (1968); Bowie (2007). For the relationship between comedy or iambus and skoptic epigram, see Brecht (1930); Schatzmann (2012), 96–105; Kanellou's chapter in this volume. On the miniaturization of earlier poetry in Greek epigram, see Harder's chapter in this volume.

⁶ Floridi (2010, 22–30; 2013c).

⁷ It is not a coincidence that praise poetry sometimes proclaims the inability of art to reproduce the perfection of feminine beauty; see e.g. Aus. *Bissula* 5 Green.

As an example of satire directed at bad artists, I mention here an epigram attributed by Planudes to Leonidas (of Alexandria) but surviving as anonymous in manuscript P and probably to be assigned to a different poet:⁸

εἰκόνα Μηνოდότου γράψας Διόδωρος ἔθηκε
πλὴν τοῦ Μηνოდότου πᾶσιν ὁμοιότατην.
(‘Leon.’ or anon. AP 11.213)

Diodorus, painting Menodotus’ portrait, made it
resemble everyone except Menodotus.⁹

The idea of resemblance is used to mock a painter’s ineptitude:¹⁰ *ὁμοῖος*, the *terminus technicus* in ecphrastic contexts that celebrate the true-to-life quality of a work of art,¹¹ is employed in order to stigmatize the artist’s failure. The poem opens as an actual ecphrastic epigram would; the second line, though, provides it with a punchline that clarifies the skoptic nature of the text.

Lucillius AP 11.215 (Neronian era) plays with the same idea and the same terminology:¹²

εἴκοσι γεννήσας ὁ ζωγράφος Εὐτυχὸς υἱοὺς
οὐδ’ ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων οὐδὲν ὅμοιον ἔχει.
(Lucill. AP 11.215 = 88 Fl^b)

Eutychus the painter was the father of twenty sons
but never achieved a likeness even among his children.

The distich stresses that not even among his many children did the painter Eutychus produce a true likeness of himself. The poet openly mocks him for having been betrayed (too many times) by his wife¹³ and, indirectly, for being a bad painter too, unable to create lifelike paintings. Once again, the opening words create the impression that this epigram is ecphrastic: *γεννήσας* might induce the expectation of a variation on the theme of the artist as a ‘father’

⁸ Unlike the other epigrams composed by Leonidas of Alexandria, the poem is not isopsephic. Therefore Page (1981), 511 is probably right to consider the Planudean lemma spurious.

⁹ All translations of epigrams are adapted versions of Paton’s Loeb translation. All other translations are my own. The Greek texts are from Beckby (1965; 1968), Fl^a (Strato), and Fl^b (Lucillius).

¹⁰ *Γράφας* is the technical verb for painting, and the epigram is part of a section *εἰς ζωγράφους* (AP 11.212–15).

¹¹ See e.g. Asclep. or Posidipp. AP 68.2 = Asclep. HE 39.2, Maced. AP 6.175.3 = 22.3 Madden, anon. AP 175.2, and AP 352.1.

¹² The *topoi* related to the true-to-life quality of the work of art are used by Lucillius in order to mock the most diverse cast of targets, see AP 11.75 = 7 Fl^b, AP 11.233 = 91 Fl^b, and AP 11.211 = 85 Fl^b. For puns on *ὁμοῖος* and its cognates, see also anon. AP 11.149, AP 11.151, and AP 318 (with Floridi 2013c); in Latin poetry, see Aus. *Epigr.* 45, 46, 47, 51 Green (with Floridi 2013b, 97–103).

¹³ The children’s *ὁμοιότης* to their fathers was taken as a guarantee of the wives’ chastity. See e.g. Ps.-Phoc. 178, Charito 2.11.2, Mart. 6.27.3–4, and Catull. 61.224–5; cf. Gow (1952) on Theoc. *Id.* 17.44; Bettini (1992), 213–21.

of his artefact.¹⁴ The final words of verse 1 (νιούς) and of verse 2 (ἔχει) clarify the joke.

For satire against ugly people, an anonymous epigram of unknown date is examined here:

τὸν παχὺν εὖ ἔγραψ' ὁ ζωγράφος· ἀλλ' ἀπόλοιτο,
εἰ δύο μισητοὺς ἀνθ' ἑνὸς ὀφείμεθα.

(anon. AP 11.250)

The artist painted the fat man well, but to hell with him
if we shall look on two hateful people instead of one.

Initially the artist's ability is acknowledged, according to a standard ecphrastic feature (compare v. 1 εὖ ἔγραψ' ὁ ζωγράφος with e.g. anon. AP 84.1, οὐκ ἀδαῆς ἔγραψε Κίμων τᾶδε, 'with no ignorant hand did Cimon paint these'), but in this case it is the good quality of the image that provokes the *skomma*. The subject of the portrait is characterized by its poor aesthetic quality: he is a παχὺς, 'a fat man', a word that probably also evokes stupidity and grossness, as it is often used in comedy and prose to signify the 'thick-witted'.¹⁵ The almost 'Platonic' reproduction of reality is not appreciated by those who observe the painting. The epigram presents itself as belonging to the ecphrastic tradition by representing a viewer's cognitive or emotional reaction in front of a work of art. An image can provoke a number of responses in the observer, from puzzlement to amazement, from pity to fear, erotic desire,¹⁶ or actual love (as in the myth of Pygmalion).¹⁷ Here, ironically, it provokes a double hatred, and the artist is cursed (ἀλλ' ἀπόλοιτο, v. 1); this is a feature that reverses, in its turn, the motif of praise for the artist, sometimes found in ecphrastic contexts.¹⁸

To go one step further, we should wonder whether the use of παχὺς invites the reader to consider the poem at a deeper level. It is widely recognized that in ecphrastic epigram 'poets use works of art to speak not only about artistic values, but also their own poetological principles'.¹⁹ As Michael Squire puts it,

¹⁴ See e.g. anon. AP 83.1–2, Αἴαν, Τιμομάχου πλεόν ἢ πατρός, ἥρπασε τέχνα | τὴν φύσιν ('Ajax, more the son of Timomachus than your own father's, art seized on you as you really were'); anon. AP 9.726, ἃ βοῦς ἃ τίκτους' ἀπὸ γαστέρος ἔπλασε τὰν βοῶν | ἃ δὲ Μύρωνος χεῖρ οὐ πλάσεν, ἀλλ' ἔτεκεν ('The cow, its mother, moulded this heifer giving birth to it, but the hand of Myron did not mould it, but gave birth to it').

¹⁵ See LSJ s.v. παχὺς, III. One should also note that obesity was generally considered a sign of obtuseness; see Agosti (2001), 244 and n. 33.

¹⁶ Some of the most common reactions to an art object are analysed by Gutzwiller (2002), 95–104.

¹⁷ For ancient stories about people falling in love with statues and paintings, see Bettini (1992); for the theme in ancient *progymnasmata*, see Stramaglia (2003).

¹⁸ See anon. III.169.5–6 Cougny (1890), discussed by A. Cameron (1993), 238–9.

¹⁹ Männlein-Robert (2007a), 253. The old analogy between poetry and painting (*ut pictura poësis*) is obviously the premise for this. Among the many works on the topic, see at least Goldhill (1994); Gutzwiller (2002; 2004b); L. Rossi (2001); Meyer (2005; 2007); Männlein-Robert (2007b); Prioux (2007; 2008); Squire (2010b; 2010c). The sources for the comparison between art and literature in antiquity are collected and discussed by Benediktson (2000).

‘[t]he crafted products of the artists serve as metapoetic figures for the literary creations of the poet’.²⁰ Poets play with the dual sense of words that on the surface describe the artist’s skilfulness but at the same time convey information about their own art. *Παχύς* can perhaps be considered as a natural opposite of *λεπτός*, a well-known term of literary and art criticism, which expresses the technical refinement of a poem or artefact:²¹ as far as I know, its use in art criticism is not attested but, since it is employed for literary style (see Callimachus’ famous judgement on Antimachus’ *Lyde*, fr. 398 Pf., as *παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τὸρόν*, ‘a fat poem and unclear’),²² this might be due to the incomplete nature of the surviving evidence.

If, for an ancient audience, the term *παχύς* had metaliterary associations, then the beginning of the epigram would become almost oxymoronic: the painter did a great job (*εὖ ἔγραψ’ ὁ ζωγράφος*, v. 1) by painting something ‘gross’ (*τὸν παχύν*, v. 1; as opposed to *λεπτός*, *παχύς* would, according to this interpretation, designate the poor quality of the work of art). Nevertheless, the ‘grossness’ of the subject—not of the artistic work, which per se is blamelessly ‘refined’—provokes the observer’s resentment and hatred. In other words, the anonymous epigrammatist appeals to the blurring of art and reality often suggested in the writings of ecphrastic authors.²³ However, by way of reversal, this motif does not serve the purpose of praising the painter and the painted object but is employed for satirical purposes. An ugly reality, in spite of the artist’s technical accomplishment, can arouse the viewer’s disappointment and hate, that is, the opposite of amazement and love, two of a viewer’s most typical responses to works of art in ecphrastic epigram. The skoptic game in *AP* 11.250 could thus employ and adapt not only the language and topoi of ecphrastic epigram but also its very essence, its tendency to construct a critical discourse.

3. A DISPARAGING EVOCATION OF A WORK OF ART: SKOPTIC EPIGRAM AND VISUAL PARODY

A similar interpretation is possible for Ammianus or Nicarchus *AP* 11.102, which gives us the opportunity to explore a different kind of engagement of skoptic epigram with ecphrasis and, more generally, with the visual arts:

²⁰ Squire (2010c), 76.

²¹ See e.g. Theoc. *Id.* 15.79. Lucian, by praising the fineness of the fingers of Alcamenes’ *Aphrodite of the Gardens*, suggests a comprehensive critical judgement on the artist’s style (Luc. *Im.* 6); cf. Maffei (1994), xxvii–xxviii. On the metapoetic associations of the critical concept of *λεπτότης* in Hellenistic epigram, see Prioux (2007), 51–6.

²² For other examples of *παχύς* applied to speech and bearing the sense ‘coarse, heavy’, see *LSJ* s.v. *παχύς*, I. 6.

²³ See e.g. Gutzwiller (2002), 102–4.

ἐξαίρων ποτ' ἄκανθαν ὁ λεπτακινὸς Διοδώρος
 αὐτὸς ἐτρύπησεν τῷ ποδὶ τὴν βελόνην.
 (Ammian. or Nicarch. AP 11.102)

Thin little Diodorus once in taking a thorn out
 made a hole in the needle with his foot.

Here a λεπτός, 'a thin man', one of the human categories most often attacked by skoptic authors, is trying to remove a thorn from his foot with the aid of a needle, but he is so thin that the needle is pierced by his foot, and not vice versa.

The situation described certainly recalls the iconographic theme known as the 'thorn-puller',²⁴ of which the most famous version is the bronze sculpture *Boy with a Thorn* or *Spinario*, now in the Palazzo dei Conservatori in Rome (see Figure 18.1): a beautiful, rustic boy is absorbed in the ordinary activity of pulling a thorn from the sole of his foot. An object of scholarly discussion due to the peculiar combination of a late Hellenistic body with an archaizing head in Severe style, the statue is nowadays considered by most to be the product of the eclectic school of Pasiteles (c.50 BCE).²⁵ Several other specimens of this popular subject are preserved,²⁶ and they are all likely to be copies of a lost third-century BCE Hellenistic original.

Although the detail of the needle seems not to have a parallel in classical visual representations of the subject—the thorn-puller apparently removes the thorn with his own hands, though indeed in the variant where two people are involved²⁷ the thorn can be removed with a tool²⁸—the gesture portrayed in the epigram is clearly recognizable. Thus, I submit, the original recipients of the joke were implicitly required to supplement visually a well-known image, and the contrast between the beautiful youth who is usually represented as the

²⁴ For this interpretation, see Floridi (2013a), 179–85. For a variant of the thorn-puller theme where two individuals are involved (Pan removes the thorn from a satyr's foot or vice versa), see Bieber (1961), 148; Marquardt (1995), 212–26; Pollitt (1986), fig. 43; P. Zanker (1974), 73–4. This has suggested a Dionysiac origin for the type, see Moreno (1999), 100; Amedick (2005). In literature, for the famous scene described at Theoc. *Id.* 4.50–7, which is certainly influenced by the visual arts, see Hunter (1999), 141–2.

²⁵ Fuchs (1958); P. Zanker (1974), 71–5; Smith (1991), 136–7. The statuary type might have initially played on the contrast between the subject—a humble rustic boy—and the refined technique used to realize it; G. Zanker (2004), 133–6, speaks of genre crossing and proposes a suggestive parallel with the taste for genre and style crossing in Hellenistic literature.

²⁶ Because of its pastoral theme, the statue was particularly suitable for garden decoration: the base of the *Thorn-Puller* from the Castellani collection, for instance, is shaped as a rock, with a hole for a fountain pipe.

²⁷ See n. 24 in this chapter.

²⁸ See e.g. the statuary group that represents Pan removing a thorn from a satyr's foot, which is now at the Louvre; this group dates from the second century CE and is based on an original from around 50 BCE. For such an interpretation of the motif, see also the medieval mosaic inspired by the *Thorn-Puller* in the Otranto Cathedral.



Fig. 18.1. *The Thorn-Puller* (*Spinario Capitolino*), Inv. MC 1186/S—Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, Sala dei Trionfi. Archivio Fotografico dei Musei Capitolini, Rome/photograph by Zeno Colantoni.

© Roma, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali—Musei Capitolini.

thorn-puller and the λεπτακινός of the epigram was intended to convey humoristic overtones.

The poem hints at the possibility that the artistic heritage provided satirical authors with a repertoire of shared images that they used parodically, in exactly the same way as comic and skoptic poets used the literary heritage as

a reserve for parodic rewritings and humorous allusions. Studies on visual humour have stressed that sometimes, in vase or wall painting, it is the interaction between word and image that produces a humorous effect: a traditional, eulogistic inscription becomes ironic when accompanied by humoristic images,²⁹ and vice versa.³⁰

We can thus suggest that, in a context where images and words are severed from each other, such as in skoptic epigram, the original connection between image and text is reposed through the evocation of famous iconographic motifs, and the epigram itself forms a kind of illustration or ironic reflection on them. As 'serious' ecphrastic epigrams, once separated from their objects in the migration from the inscriptional form to a literary dimension, comment on or evoke a specific artefact, leaving to the reader the task of imagining it,³¹ so skoptic epigrams can recall a famous iconographic motif in order to suggest an opposite image, aimed at deriding a human defect.

Moreover, Greek and Roman art actually experimented with the comic debasement of the well-known subject of the thorn-puller. This may be seen, for instance, in the bronze figurine in the Louvre, a grotesque and humorous adaptation (Figure 18.2), which attests to the success of this iconographic scheme (and, more generally, of figures of sick and disabled people and scenes of everyday life in Hellenistic art, where realism and caricature are deliberately combined).³² In accordance with its illustrious model, the figure is seated, bent over, concentrating on the thorn he is withdrawing from his foot. However, his limbs are long and fragile, his features emaciated, his ribcage hypertrophied, and his back hunched. Another example is the so-called *Black Spinario statue* (c.135 BCE) found in Priene, Ionia and hosted today in Berlin (Staatliche Museen, Antikensammlung), which portrays the thorn-puller as a young black man sitting on a low mound and looking down with puffed cheeks as he extracts a thorn from his foot (Figure 18.3).³³

²⁹ See e.g. the Attic red-figure cup now in Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire (R 259), whose subject is a urinating (and maybe defecating) young boy. For the traditional inscription *ὁ παῖς καλός*, which criticizes the image ironically and with humoristic effects, see Mitchell (2009), 90–1.

³⁰ See e.g. the crude maxims attributed to the Seven Sages in the Tavern of the Seven Sages in Pompeii (Clarke 1998–9, 36–46; 2007, 125–32). The authoritative characters are portrayed in traditional poses; it is the contrast between the dignified images and the maxims that accompany them that provokes the humour (the image of Solon is accompanied by the caption *ut bene cacaret ventrem palpavit Solon*, 'Solon rubbed his belly to defecate well', the one of Thales by *durum cacantes monuit ut nitant Thales*, 'Thales advised the constipated to press hard', etc.).

³¹ As Männlein-Robert (2007a), 253 argues, 'in literary epigram what had been the viewer of a monument is transformed into the reader of a scroll. It is thus left to the reader to imagine the work of art since the new writtenness of poetry severs the previously close connection between art and text characteristic of inscribed epigram, whether funerary or dedicatory'.

³² R. Garland (2010), 105–22.

³³ See also Moreno (1999), 96 and 100, fig. 116.



Fig. 18.2. Grotesque as the Thorn-Puller, Louvre, Paris, fourth/third century BCE.

Photo © RMN-Grand Palais (Musée du Louvre)/photograph by Hervé Lewandowski.

Thus AP 11.102 becomes, so to speak, a ‘verbal equivalent’ of these humorous adaptations of the statuary type.³⁴ It is tempting to trace a parallel also between the *size* of these plastic parodies, which are all usually realized in miniature scale,³⁵ and epigram, the miniature poem par excellence, especially in the single-couplet form taken by AP 11.102.³⁶ Be that as it may, one should note that the deformation in the poem is not a gratuitous caricature: it aims to ridicule the features of an individual—Diodorus—and the evocation of a well-known image contributes to making the mockery more effective.

³⁴ The contrast between the image of beauty evoked by the gesture of the *Thorn-Puller* and the ugliness of the characters involved in such parodic deformations, plastic or literary, might have been stressed by the iconographic type of Eros as a thorn-puller that was found in everyday objects, such as terracotta lamps and knife handles (Blanc and Gury 1986, 1017 nn. 531 and 532), a fact that testifies (again) to the diffusion of the type.

³⁵ As R. Garland (2010), 105 puts it, ‘[t]he chief artistic inspiration throughout antiquity was the physically perfect human body... Greek artists show little interest in portraying the deformed... The exceptions to this rule are mainly to be found in the humble artistic media of vase-painting and miniature statuary’; see also Dasen (1993), 165–6.

³⁶ On the *Einzeldistichon*, particularly popular from the first century CE onwards, see Lausberg (1982).



TC 8626 © Johannes Laurentius / SMB Antikensammlung Die Namensnennung des Fotografen ist Bedingung für jede Veröffentlichung

Fig. 18.3. Terracotta, Priene, second century BCE. Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz.

TC 8626 © Johannes Laurentius/SMB Antikensammlung.

To go back to our starting point, in a context deliberately bringing into play the visual arts, the play on Diodorus' λεπτότης can acquire a 'technical' sense: as already mentioned, not only do λεπτός and its cognates have a specific rhetorical meaning, but they are also used in the jargon of art criticism to express the accurate delicacy of details, the technical refinement of the artefact. Once the image of the thorn-puller—and maybe also of its grotesque adaptations—is evoked in the mind of the audience of the epigram, the adjective λεπτακινός³⁷ can convey such a technical meaning, ironically suggesting the 'aesthetic accuracy' of Diodorus' image and thus making the implicit comparison with the iconographic referent more successful. In other words, the author of the epigram employs the technical language of literature and art criticism so as to revisit humorously the ecphrastic tradition, where such language was used to express critical judgements on both the artistic object and the epigrammatist's art.³⁸

While in the poems analysed in the preceding sections the mention of the work of art, or of the artist himself, made the play with ecphrastic conventions clearly recognizable, AP 11.102 toys with them in a different way: it elicits in the audience the same kind of intellectual response elicited by actual ecphrastic epigrams, thus activating a similar mental mechanism: visualization, prompted by a verbal stimulus, of a work of art.

4. 'VERBAL' EVOCATION

I shall now analyse a kind of engagement with ecphrastic epigram that is based on the verbal evocation of the *typology* of poems celebrating a work of art (and, as a result, of the works of art themselves). The following poem, composed by a certain Ammonides, is a single couplet based on a counterfactual 'if' clause that vividly evokes a woman's ugly appearance:

Ἀντιπάτραν γυμνὴν εἴ τις Πάρθοισιν ἔδειξεν,
ἔκτοθεν ἂν στηλῶν Ἡρακλέους ἔφυγον.
(Ammonides AP 11.201)

If anyone had shown Antipatra naked to the Parthians,
they would have fled outside the Pillars of Heracles.

³⁷ Λεπτακινός is a late and rare variant of λεπτός; see Floridi (2013a), 180 n. 3 (it should also be noted that the 'technical' term λεπτός appears in Lucill. AP 11.308 = 112 Fl^b, which could also play with the motif of the thorn-puller and is closely imitated in this epigram).

³⁸ The fact that the word ἄκανθαν (v. 1), in the light of its metaphorical associations, was often used to describe the 'thorny' issues confronted by grammarians (Antip. Thess. AP 11.20.2 = GPh 20.2, Antiphan. AP 11.322.2 = GPh 9.2, Phil. AP 11.347.2 = GPh 61.2), could also be significant in this context.

As in some of the epigrams previously analysed, ugliness is the central theme, but (as in Ammianus or Nicarchus *AP* 11.102) neither an artist nor a work of art is mentioned. Nevertheless, the poem is clearly indebted to ecphrastic epigram. The detail of the woman's nakedness reminds us of the poems celebrating Aphrodite, where the goddess' nudity is often mentioned as a way of praising the artist, who allegedly had the privilege of seeing her naked.³⁹ Typically, these epigrams jocularly 'revise' the myth: a certain character reacts to a work of art by changing his or her mind about a mythical event in which he or she had played a central role (a structure clearly influenced by the ancient school practice of *ethopoiia*, which was included among the *progymnasmata* and involved imagining the words that a famous person could have pronounced in a given situation).⁴⁰ For example, in Leonidas of Tarentum *AP* 182.8–9 = *HE* 23.8–9, in front of Apelles' *Anadyomene*, 'Athena herself and the consort of Zeus shall say: "O Zeus, we are worsted in the judgement"' (αὐτὰ δ' Ἀθὰνα καὶ Διὸς συνευνέτις | φάσουσιν· ὦ Ζεῦ, λειπόμεσθα τῇ κρίσει); or we may recall the variations of this epigram by Antipater of Sidon *AP* 178.5–6 = *HE* 45.5–6 and Euenus *AP* 165 = *GPh* 10, where a similar declaration is inspired by the *Aphrodite of Cnidus*.

The 'mythical revision' can also be based on a hypothetical situation, and this is particularly relevant for us: if a certain character had seen the goddess as she is portrayed by the artist, that character would (not) have acted in a certain way, or would (not) have said a certain thing. This structure is found, for instance, in Democritus *AP* 180.5–6 = *FGE* 1.5–6, εἰ δὲ τοιῷδε | κείνη, συγχέισθω θυμὸς Ἐνναλίου ('but if she is like this, let the wrath of Ares be confounded') and in Julian of Egypt *AP* 181.5–6, εἰ τοιῷ ποτὲ Κύπρις ἐγνυμώθη διὰ μῆλον, | τὴν Τροίην ἀδίκως Παλλὰς ἐληΐσατο ('If Cypris looked thus when she stripped for the apple, Pallas was unrighteous in laying Troy waste'), and must have been common in ecphrastic epigram.⁴¹ Ammonides' poem is clearly reminiscent of this ecphrastic structure: through a comic reversal, the woman's nudity, in this case, would have provoked panic and flight in the hypothetical viewers, making them run to the opposite part of the world.⁴²

³⁹ E.g. Arch. *AP* 179.2 = *GPh* 34.2 on Apelles' *Anadyomene*; anon. *AP* 159.1, 'Pl.' *AP* 160.4 = *FGE* 23.4, anon. *AP* 162.2 = *FGE* 82.2, Luc. *AP* 163, and anon. *AP* 168 on the *Aphrodite of Cnidus* by Praxiteles. This motif infringes on the taboo according to which a mortal cannot contemplate a naked goddess without consequences, a rhetorical argument that somewhat serves the purpose of stressing the artist's singularity and exceptionality, which (it is suggested) should earn him a kind of 'superhuman' status. In ecphrastic contexts, the artist is sometimes compared with a divine prototype; see e.g. Erinn. *AP* 6.352 = *HE* 3; Gutzwiller (2002), 101.

⁴⁰ Marrou (1966), 236; Stramaglia (1996), 102; for the epigrams of *AP* 9 influenced by such a practice, see L. Rossi (2002), 170–1.

⁴¹ In general, hypothetical situations and 'if' clauses are typical of ecphrastic epigram and used in several contexts, see Sens (2002).

⁴² See Aubreton (1972), 144 n. 3: *Le pays des Parthes, c'est la limite orientale du monde, comme les Colonnes d'Hercule marquent l'extrémité occidentale des terres* ('The territory of the Parthians

This reading of the poem as a parody of the epigrams on Aphrodite is supported by Strato AP 12.207 = 48 Fl^a, an erotic epigram that in turn plays with ecphrastic topoi:⁴³ the penis of a *puer* who comes out of a bath is compared to Apelles' *Anadyomene*. Had Alexander seen it that day on Mount Ida, he would have preferred it to the three goddesses of the mythical account (vv. 3–4): ταύτην εἴ τις ἔδειξεν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τότ' ἐν Ἰδῇ, | τὰς τρεῖς ἂν ταύτης προῦκατέκρινε θεάς. The analogies between Strato's and Ammonides' epigrams are noteworthy: not only do they share a similar syntactic structure (i.e. the counterfactual conditional clauses), but they also use the same language (the protasis corresponds almost perfectly: εἴ τις Πάρθοισιν ἔδειξεν ~ εἴ τις ἔδειξεν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ). It cannot be ruled out that both AP 11.201 and 12.207 rework the same (lost) poem, or that one of them draws on the other. However, it might be sufficient to explain the observed similarities by assuming that both epigrammatists reuse the same rhetorical structure, typical of ecphrastic epigram.

A similar rhetorical background is also detectable in Antipater of Thessalonica AP 11.224 = *GPh* 99,⁴⁴ where Priapus, in front of Cimon's 'naked beauty', admits to being defeated in masculinity: ἐστηκός τὸ Κίμωνος ἰδὼν πέος, εἶφ' ὁ Πρίηπος· | οἷμοι, ὑπὸ θνητοῦ λείπομαι ἀθάνατος ('Priapus, seeing Cimon's penis erect, said: "Alas, I, an immortal, am beaten by a mortal"). The words pronounced by the mythical character are reminiscent, once again, of ecphrastic epigrams that praise Aphrodite's portraits or statuary, for example the one where the mythical rivals of the goddess, Athena and Hera, admit to their defeat in the famous beauty contest when they see the beauty of Aphrodite's statue or painting (e.g. Leonidas of Tarentum *APL* 182.9 = *HE* 23.9, where the idea is expressed through λειπόμεσθα), or the ones where Cypris herself is amazed when she sees the work of art that portrays her ('Plato' *APL* 160.1–4 = *FGE* 23.1–4, anon. *APL* 162 = *FGE* 82).

As with Ammianus or Nicarchus AP 11.102, which evoked the thorn-puller, we can assume that, once the interplay with the language of epigrams celebrating Aphrodite—either *Aphrodite of Cnidus* or *Aphrodite Anadyomene*—was recognized by the audience, a mental visualization of the works of art themselves enabled the jokes on ugly Antipatra, the boy's penis, or Cimon's virility to become more effective. Both works of art were very famous in antiquity, and hence familiar to a late Hellenistic or imperial audience. *Aphrodite of Cnidus* was one of the most widely copied statues in the ancient

is the eastward margin of the world, just as the Pillars of Hercules mark the westernmost extremity of solid land").

⁴³ Strato's poetry deals with homoerotic topics in a marked satirical vein; the points of contact between his epigrams and those in AP 11 are noteworthy, see Floridi (2007), 13–20.

⁴⁴ For Antipater of Thessalonica's authorship, see Argentieri (2003), 149–51.

world (Figure 18.4).⁴⁵ Pliny, in the *Natural History* (36.20), describes it as ‘superior to all the works, not only of Praxiteles, but indeed of the whole world’ (*ante omnia est non solum Praxitelis, verum in toto orbe terrarum Venus*), and Lucian, in his *Eikones*, selects it as one of the five masterpieces from antiquity whose combination will help Lycinus—Lucian’s mouthpiece in the dialogue—to shape the portrait of Panthea.⁴⁶ Apelles’ *Aphrodite Anadyomene* (Figure 18.5) was at some point brought from the sanctuary of Asclepius in Cos to Rome, where it was placed in the shrine of Caesar by Augustus. This stimulated not only many copies of the work⁴⁷ but also the composition of many poems on the subject. According to Pliny (*HN* 35.91)—by whose time the painting was badly damaged—these eclipsed the work of art but eventually were also responsible for its fame: *Venerem exeuntem e mari divus Augustus dicavit in delubro patris Caesaris, quae Anadyomene vocatur, versibus Graecis tali opere, dum laudatur, victo, sed inlustrato*⁴⁸ (‘Augustus dedicated in the temple of his father Caesar a Venus coming out from the waters, the so-called *Anadyomene*, a work of art praised in Greek verses which have surpassed the painting in value, but have also perpetuated its fame’). The reference here is to the epigrams on the *Anadyomene* (at least to the variations known by the time of Pliny).⁴⁹ Pliny’s words recall the contest between poetry and painting in describing an object, a contest that parallels the one between poetry and sculpture.⁵⁰ In both cases, in Pliny’s view, poetry is the winner because poetry, according to him, has a more effective expressive power.⁵¹

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to explore this widely discussed issue further.⁵² What matters for my purposes is that, for epigrammatists who dealt with ecphrastic themes, a lively debate on the relationship between literature

⁴⁵ The Cnidian Aphrodite constituted the formal basis for the development of the female nude in classical statuary, see Havelock (1995).

⁴⁶ Here it is defined as τῶν Πραξιτέλους ποιημάτων τὸ κάλλιστον (‘the best of Praxiteles’ works’), with a play on the ambiguity of the word ποίημα, which denotes both the work of art and the poem (Luc. *Im.* 4). On Lucian’s *Eikones*, see Cistaro (2009); Floridi (2015b), with further bibliography.

⁴⁷ Havelock (1995), 86–8.

⁴⁸ For the opportunity to retain the reading of the manuscripts against the proposed emendations, see Croisille (1985), 203 n. 3.

⁴⁹ References to the work of art are found in Latin poetry as well, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 2.527–8, *Pont.* 4.1.29–30, *Ars am.* 3.401, and, later, Apul. *Met.* 2.17; in Greek, see also Q. S. 5.69–72.

⁵⁰ *Myronem . . . bucula maxime nobilitavit celebratis versibus laudata, quando alieno plerique ingenio magis quam suo commendantur* (‘Myron . . . was most renowned for his statue of a cow, praised in some famous poems; for many people owe their reputation not to their own talent but to someone else’s’, *HN* 34.57). For the epigrams on Myron’s cow, see Squire (2010b), with further bibliography.

⁵¹ See Corso, Mugellesi, and Rosati (1988), 389 n. 1.

⁵² For a synthesis of the reflections on the relationship between word and image from the sixth century BCE to late antiquity, see Maffei (1994), xv–xviii; for a survey through humanism and beyond, see Lee (1967).



Fig. 18.4. The *Colonna Venus* in the Museo Pio-Clementino belongs to the collections of the Vatican Museums. It is probably the most faithful replica of the lost Cnidian Aphrodite.

Photo © Musei Vaticani.



Fig. 18.5. *Aphrodite Anadyomene*, Pompeian mural from the House of Venus in the Shell.

© Archivio fotografico Pompei, courtesy of the Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo—Soprintendenza Pompei. This picture cannot be reproduced or copied in any form.

and the visual arts existed in the background.⁵³ This involved a profound meditation on the ‘visual’ qualities of words: through the medium of language, poets appealed to the readership’s *phantasia*, making them *visualize* the works of art to which they were alluding. According to ancient definitions, ecphrasis is in fact the ability ‘to make present what is absent’,⁵⁴ and it has the specific rhetorical function of helping the speaker to arouse emotions in the listeners so as to make them share one’s perspective and thus, ultimately, accept one’s version of events. The capacity of language to make people actually see an image through the vividness (*enargeia*) of a verbal stimulus is also exploited by skoptic authors; in particular, these poets arouse mental images in their audience by playing to its knowledge of visual materials.⁵⁵ The reason for

⁵³ Particularly relevant, on this point, is Squire (2010c). For the poems on the *Anadyomene*, see Gutzwiller (2002), 102–4; Squire (2010a), 148–52; Platt (2002), 35.

⁵⁴ *Ἐκφρασίς ἐστι λόγος περιγηματικός, ὥς φασι, ἐναργής καὶ ὑπ’ ὅψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον* (‘Ecphrasis is a descriptive speech, as they say, which is vivid and brings the subject shown before the eyes’, Ps.-Hermogen. *Prog.* 10 p. 122 Rabe^a). This is how ecphrasis is almost unanimously defined in rhetorical manuals. See Webb (2009), esp. 1–11 for a comparison between the ancient definition of ecphrasis and the modern one.

⁵⁵ Although in antiquity ecphrasis was not exclusively linked to works of art (cf. n. 1 in this chapter), ‘for those with access to them, the visual arts were also a possible source of mental images’, as pointed out by Webb (2009), 120.

taking advantage of the resources of what can be called 'mental painting' is linked to the persuasive power widely attributed to ecphrasis in antiquity. The ancients themselves highlighted the points of contact between humour and oratory, as they were aware of the role of laughter in gaining the audience's approval.⁵⁶ From a reversed perspective, rhetorical strategies and, in particular, the power of words to create a verbal depiction can contribute to the efficacy of a joke, since they can provide a visual aid to what might be called 'satirical persuasion', in other words the audience's involvement in the derisory strategy on which the joke is based. The skoptic authors' final aim, when exploiting their audience's ability to mentally supplement images of visual elements, is to elicit laughter, mostly at the expense of a given type of person. Even for this purpose, the resources of *enargeia* and *phantasia* might prove to be very helpful.

⁵⁶ See Cicero's excursus 'De ridiculis' (*De or.* 2.216–90, with Monaco 1968) and Quintilian's chapter 'De risu' (*Inst.* 6.3, with Monaco 1970).

Ecphrasis and Iconoclasm

Palladas' Epigrams on Statues

Peter Bing

The late antique epigrammatist Palladas of Alexandria is the best-represented author of the *Greek Anthology*, and his works from that source have recently been supplemented by remains of some sixty further epigrams in the fragmentary papyrus codex from the Beineke Library at Yale (*P. CtYBR inv. 4000*), now published by Kevin Wilkinson.¹ In both these collections, there emerges a unique poetic voice, distinctively querulous, world-weary, sardonic, whose speaker—identifying himself repeatedly as a Hellene (*Ἕλληνας*, see *AP* 10.82 and 10.90, and compare *AP* 10.89), that is, as a non-Christian, and as a schoolteacher (*γραμματικός*, see *AP* 9.168, 9.171, 9.173, 9.175, and 11.378)—confronts a turbulent world in which the rise of Christianity in the Roman empire challenged and overthrew the old Hellenic order.²

Much work on Palladas of the last half century has sought to use the epigrams to shed light on the author's historical circumstances. Scholars have thus tried to link particular poems to specific events, creating a Palladan chronology in which the epigrams, strung together, constitute a virtual 'Life of Palladas'. Thus, for instance, Bowra connects certain epigrams to the anti-pagan reforms of Theodosius I in the 380s and 390s CE,³ which in Alexandria—the presumed setting of the poems—led to the notorious Christian attacks on Greek cult, in particular to the seizure of the Serapeum under Bishop Theophilus in 391 CE.⁴ Bowra's

¹ See Wilkinson (2012), which is the *editio princeps*. On the whole, the arguments for Palladas' authorship of the new poems seem persuasive. For reasonable doubts, however, see Floridi's (2014b) review.

² On Palladas' relationship to Christianity, see Zerwes (1956), 359–65; Luck (1958); Bowra (1959; 1960a); A. Cameron (1964; 1965a).

³ Bowra (1959).

⁴ Hahn (2008) gives a critical assessment of the date. For Palladas' despair in the face of such events, see the grim close of his epigram *AP* 10.90.5–7: 'We Hellenes are men reduced to ashes,

historical–biographical narrative, which argues that Palladas lived between around 319 CE and the 390s, is a satisfying tale, if ultimately a quite speculative one.

Speculation notwithstanding, the basic impulse to mine the epigrams for historical data continues to the present day. Most recently, Wilkinson has proposed setting Palladas' birth far earlier, around 260 CE, and taking many of those same epigrams that Bowra and others had linked to the Christian–pagan conflicts of Alexandria in the 380s and 390s as in fact referring to events sixty years earlier, during the reign of Constantine in the 320s and 330s.⁵ While Wilkinson does not spin out a thoroughgoing biographical narrative for Palladas, as Bowra had, he does use his redating to argue that the poet was present in Constantinople 'not long after its foundation'⁶ and that more of his poems than had previously been imagined refer—with topical relevance—to monuments in Constantine's new capital. In all, the redating means for him, as he puts it, 'something rather extraordinary: we have managed to recover a contemporary pagan witness to the final period of Constantine's reign'.⁷

While I find Wilkinson's new dating plausible, if still speculative,⁸ my concern in this paper is not with tying the epigrams of Palladas to specific historical events, personages, or sites. The poet's references are, for the most part, too vague to allow certainty.⁹ My focus instead is on *ecphrasis*. In particular, I want to examine how Palladas adapted conventions of *ecphrasis* to a new cultural climate, one in which Hellenic religion was under attack by increasingly assertive Christians, who desecrated not only Greek cult sites but also a chief object of *ecphrastic* description: images of the gods, wherever they could find them.¹⁰ For my purpose, it makes no great difference whether Palladas was referring to events of the 320s and 330s or of the 390s.

holding to our buried hopes in the dead; for everything has now been turned on its head' (*Ἑλληνές ἐσμεν ἄνδρες ἐσποδωμένοι | νεκρῶν ἔχοντες ἐλπίδας τεθαμμέναις | ἀνεστράφη γὰρ πάντα νῦν τὰ πράγματα*, trans. Wilkinson 2010a, 182). The final line is echoed in Pall. AP 9.181.1, on the misfortune of a statue of Tyche; see pp. 332–4 here.

⁵ Wilkinson (2009; 2010a).

⁶ Wilkinson (2010a), 180.

⁷ Wilkinson (2009), 52.

⁸ For a sceptical appraisal that attempts to split the difference between Wilkinson's proposal and the earlier consensus, see A. Cameron (2016). See also the meticulous critique of Wilkinson's arguments for redating by Floridi (2016), who supports the older view that situates Palladas' work in the late fourth–early fifth century CE, even while conceding that her considerations 'do not claim to solve the thorny question of Palladas' chronology; on the contrary, they intend to confirm the difficulty of interpreting univocally and coherently the data in our possession, in order to solicit further critical debate' (*non pretendono di risolvere la spinosa questione della cronologia di Pallada; intendono, al contrario, ribadire la difficoltà di interpretare in modo univoco e coerente i dati in nostro possesso, per sollecitare ulteriore dibattito critico*, 54).

⁹ As Wilkinson himself puts it (2010a), 180: 'This is not to deny that there are risks in attempting to pinpoint some of these allusions; there is inevitably a measure of conjecture involved in this sort of endeavour.'

¹⁰ For the vandalization of pagan statuary by Christians in the centuries after Constantine's establishment of Christianity as the state religion, see Mango (1963), whose treatment focuses

Ecphrasis, it is worth noting, is not particularly common in Palladas. Descriptions of sites, monuments, or objects—and of the act of viewing and construing them—are comparatively rare. Where they do occur, however, Palladas dwells on monuments that have been disfigured or transformed. Their very disfigurement and transformation—the metamorphosis of a monument from one state into another—become his theme. Already Simonides (*PMG* 581) had, of course, pointed out that monuments may suffer change: their strength is no match for the elements of nature, and ‘even mortal hands can shatter stone’ (λίθον δὲ καὶ βρότεοι παλάμαι θραύονται, vv. 5–6).¹¹ But that was framed merely as an eventuality, and the norm was rather to view monuments as emblems of permanence.¹² Palladas, by contrast, contemplates and reflects on the altered monument. This is true not only for the epigrams from the *Greek Anthology* but also for those from the new papyrus codex, where for example Palladas may, by means of a haunting image, refer to the destroyed Alexandrian Museum as ‘an empty tomb of the Muses’ (κενὸν Μουσῶν ἡρίον (Wilkinson 2012, 9, lines 25–9, here l. 29): a thriving shrine, in other words, transformed into a cenotaph.¹³

Just how far-reaching were the threats to statues of the old Hellenic gods? A well-known epigram by Palladas offers a trenchant commentary on this question by suggesting that only on Olympus might the gods still be safe from the risk of mutilation that their statues were now suffering:

Χριστιανοὶ γεγαῶτες Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἐνθάδε ναιετάουσιν ἀπήμονες· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτοῦς
χώνη φόλλιν ἄγουσα φερέσβιον ἐν πυρὶ θήσει.
(Pall. AP 9.528)

Having turned Christian, those who have their houses on Olympus
live there without injury. For no melting pot
will place them in the fire so as to make a life-giving coin.¹⁴

especially on Constantinople. On iconoclasm against statues generally in late antiquity, see Stewart (1999), who sets it in the longstanding tradition of *damnatio memoriae*.

¹¹ In the same vein, see Juv. 10.144–6, which describes how ‘the malevolent strength of a barren fig tree suffices to shatter stones, seeing that even tombs have their doom assigned to them’ (*saxis... ad quae | discutienda valent sterilis mala robora fici, | quandoquidem data sunt ipsis quoque fata sepulcris*).

¹² See Bing (2014), 1–2.

¹³ The poem is plausibly linked by Wilkinson to the Alexandrian Museum, on the grounds that it is followed by one about the destruction of Alexandria (Wilkinson 2012, 9, lines 30–3, which praise Hermopolis because it is not home to a ‘lawless tribe of sailors’ who ‘destroyed Alexandria’, ναῦται Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἀπώλεσαν, l. 33). In another poem (*ibid.*, 12, lines 32–4), the obscure Egyptian goddess Triphis (or perhaps her statue?), who has ‘suffered a lot’, ‘tells the people of Lycopolis: “you hardly want to flee into this disease”’ (ἡ Τρίφρις τάδε φησὶ Λύκων πόλι πολλὰ παθοῦσα: | ‘εἰς τὸ νόσημα φυγεῖν τοῦτο μὲν θέλεις’).

¹⁴ All translations are my own unless otherwise noted. For the text of Palladas’ epigrams in the *Greek Anthology*, I follow the edition of Beckby (1957–8).

This epigram (which is not, I think, ecphrastic) has been misinterpreted since Byzantine times as referring to a group of statues kept safe from damage and reuse by being moved to a safe place: ‘here’, ἐνθάδε (v. 2), before the viewers’ eyes. The lemma to the poem identifies the location as ‘the house of Marina’. Yet although the Byzantine lemmata of the *Greek Anthology* have long been held suspect, scholars have followed the lead of the specific lemma in understanding the adverb to mean ‘here’, that is, a place different from the Ὀλύμπια δώματα of verse 1. In my opinion, however, the poem comes into sharper focus if we construe ἐνθάδε as ‘there’, ‘in that place’, that is, on Olympus. The caustic point of ἐνθάδε, then, is that even those who live far from the encroachments of Christianity, seemingly secure in the most remote bastions of paganism such as Mt Olympus, take the precaution of converting so as to remain safe. Elsewhere, by contrast, statues of the old Hellenic gods remain at risk of degradation, a kind of forced ‘conversion’ by being cast into a melting pot (χώνη, v. 3) only to turn up as coinage, the *folles*, a Roman denomination.¹⁵

Such were the threats to which statues of the gods were exposed, as Palladas’ ecphrases on defaced monuments vividly attest. Before turning to these, however, it may be helpful to consider one of the few more conventional ecphrastic poems of Palladas as a baseline.¹⁶ The epigram in question concerns a statue or painting of Eros.¹⁷ It is located in a series from Planudes by poets from various eras on works of art that depict this god. Statues of Eros disarmed

¹⁵ Wilkinson (2009), 54–6 (with n. 120) has argued—in the context of his redating of Palladas—that this poem reflects circumstances in the 320s and 330s when ‘Constantine was short of funds required to carry out his ambitious plans. In order to restock the treasury, he commissioned some of his *comites* to tour the cities of the Empire (in all likelihood only the Eastern Empire) and confiscate precious metals belonging to pagan temples—their doors, their roofs, and especially their statues’ (55). Like previous scholars, Wilkinson sees the poem as referring to a group of statues of the Olympian gods now used in a Christian setting: ‘The usual fate of pagan statues captured by Constantine was to be turned into coins, but some brazen gods managed to avoid this end by converting to Christianity—that is, by leaving their pagan cult behind and taking up residence in the new Christian capital of this very Christian emperor’ (56). For further discussion of the meaning of *folles* and whether it refers to a small or a large sum, see Wilkinson (2010b), 299–302. A. Cameron (2016), 93–7 casts doubt on Wilkinson’s argument that the melting of bronze statues into coinage reflects Constantinian practice; evidence for that time, he claims, points only to the melting of gold and silver. See Wilkinson (2017), 275 for a rebuttal.

¹⁶ On ecphrasis and the depiction of art in poetry generally, see Goldhill (1994; 2007); G. Zanker (2004); Männlein-Robert (2007a; 2007b); Prioux (2008); Marino and Stavru (2013); Floridi’s chapter in this volume.

¹⁷ Zerwes (1956), 324 compares a passage from Tzetzes (*Chil.* 5.11.500–4): ‘Painters portray Eros as a ripe young archer boy, with torch and wings, holding a dolphin and a blade of grass; and through the image of the wings, the blade of grass, and the dolphin, they signify that he rules the air, the earth, and the sea’ (ὠραῖον νέον μείρακα τὸν Ἐρωτα ζωγράφοι | τοξότην ζωγραφοῦσί τε, σὺνναμα καὶ πυρφόρον | καὶ πτερωτόν, κατέχοντα δελφίνα τε καὶ πόαν, | τῇ μὲν γραφῇ τοῦ πτερωτοῦ, τῆς πόας, τοῦ δελφίνου, | κρατεῖν τοῦτον σημαίνοντες, ἀέρος, γῆς, θαλάσσης). On the Meleagrean sequence AP 5.176–80 on Eros, see Gutzwiller’s chapter in this volume.

(and often bound) appear in ecphrastic epigrams as early as the second century BCE,¹⁸ and our poem falls into that tradition:

γυμνὸς Ἔρως· διὰ τοῦτο γελᾷ καὶ μείλιχός ἐστιν·
οὐ γὰρ ἔχει τόξον καὶ πυρόεντα βέλη·
οὐδὲ μάτην παλάμαις κατέχει δελφίνα καὶ ἄνθος·
τῇ μὲν γὰρ γαῖαν, τῇ δὲ θάλασσαν ἔχει.

(Pall. *API* 207)

Eros is naked and therefore is smiling and gentle,
for he is not wearing his bow or his blazing darts.
Nor is it pointless that he clasps in his hands a dolphin and flower,
for with the one he is holding the earth, with the other the sea.

The speaker here begins each couplet by stating what he sees and then interpreting the image at hand on that basis. Eros is naked, the speaker declares, and to his mind Eros' nudity *explains* the god's smile as well as his gentleness (διὰ τοῦτο γελᾷ καὶ μείλιχός ἐστιν, v. 1). Even if μείλιχία is not an obvious physical trait visible to the eye, the speaker nonetheless justifies his assessment of the god's mildness with the added observation (introduced by the γάρ clause οὐ γὰρ ἔχει, v. 2) that Eros lacks his weapons, the deadly bow and arrow. Similarly, at the start of the second couplet the speaker notes that the god holds a dolphin in one hand, a flower in the other, and does not do so pointlessly (οὐδὲ μάτην, v. 3). This observation is justified yet again by a γάρ clause that explains in allegorical terms, and with sweeping chiasmus, the idea behind these attributes: his lack of arms notwithstanding, the mighty Eros controls both sea and land. Generally, then, the poem mimics the process of viewing and the concomitant act of interpretation. In portraying the act of seeing an artwork, reflecting on it, and interpreting it, the epigram thus comprises standard elements of ecphrasis.

Disfigured statues of the gods, on the other hand, do not conventionally feature in such poetry. Convention is, however, subject to the pressures of circumstance, and thus gives way to change. Palladas undoubtedly experienced such pressures as a witness to a time when sacred images were being toppled, mutilated, melted, and reused by Christian zealots. So how did he deal with such disfigurement and reuse of divine statuary in his ecphrastic poems?

¹⁸ Cf. Alc. Mess. *API* 196 = *HE* 19, with which Palladas' poem shares certain traits. For instance Alcaeus, like Palladas after him, stresses that the god does not have weapons: 'where is your swift bow, child, where your bitter quiver bearing fire?' (ποῦ θοὰ τόξα, | νήπιε, ποῦ πικρὴ πυρφόρος ἰοδόκη;, vv. 3–4). Yet for Alcaeus too, just as for Palladas, the god's lack of arms does not diminish his power ('indeed, it was in vain that the sculptor toiled, the one who bound you in this snare, you who torment the gods with your maddening sting', ἧ ῥα μάτην ἐπόνησε λιθοξόος, ὅς σε, τὸν οὔστρου | κυμήναντα θεούς, τῇδ' ἐνέδησε πάγη, vv. 5–6). Indeed, one may wonder whether Palladas' οὐδὲ μάτην (*API* 207.3) deliberately reverses Alcaeus' ἧ ῥα μάτην (*API* 196.5) at the same *sedes*.

In answer, let us examine a further epigram on an effigy of Eros: AP 9.773. Here a speaker describes how a craftsman smelted a bronze statue of the god and recast it into a frying pan, *τήγανον*.¹⁹

χαλκοτύπος τὸν Ἔρωτα μεταλλάξας ἐπόησε
τήγανον, οὐκ ἀλόγως, ὅττι καὶ αὐτὸ φλέγει.
(Pall. AP 9.773)

A bronze smith, refashioning Eros, made
a frying pan, not unreasonably, since that too scorches.

In this ecphrasis Palladas develops and applies to sacred statuary a theme from another tradition, namely narratives of ‘secular iconoclasm’,²⁰ the politically motivated destruction of images in honour of private individuals and emperors that started already in the first century CE and that, according to Peter Stewart, prefigures the religious iconoclasm of Christians targeting statues of pagan gods in the fourth century CE.²¹ Thus Juvenal, for instance, vividly recounts how an effigy of Sejanus was torn down with ropes, fed to the flames, and recast—much as in Palladas—into lowly forms such as ‘jugs, foot pans, a frying pan, chamber pots’ (*descendunt statuæ restemque sequuntur, | ... iam strident ignes, iam follibus atque caminis | ardet adoratum populo caput et crepat ingens | Sejanus, deinde ex facie toto orbe secunda | fiunt urceoli pelves sartago matellae*, Sat. 10.58–64).²² By Palladas’ time such sneering disfigurement no longer stopped at images of political enemies; it could aim even at cult statues. The epigrammatist thus appropriates a theme of secular iconoclasm—converting the image of a formerly powerful figure into some derisively humble article—and melds it to his ecphrastic account. Although we need not take Palladas’ epigram as reflecting specific circumstances in Alexandria in the year 391 CE, it is worth noting the testimony about that year in Socrates’ *Historia ecclesiastica* (5.16), if only as evidence for the *kind* of treatment statues of gods were now exposed to by hostile Christians: ‘At the solicitation of Theophilus bishop of Alexandria the emperor issued an order at this time for the demolition of the heathen temples in that city... These were therefore razed to the ground, and the images of their gods recast into pots and other convenient utensils for the use of the Alexandrian church; for the emperor had instructed Theophilus to distribute them for the relief of the poor.’²³ As this passage shows, the statues of the gods were now being transformed into objects totally alien to their original

¹⁹ On the same theme, cf. also the anon. *API* 194, which has been attributed to Palladas.

²⁰ The term is used e.g. by Stewart (1999), 159.

²¹ Ibid.

²² ‘Down come the statues, following the rope... now the flames hiss, now in the bellows and the forge the head of great Sejanus, adored by the populace, blazes, and snaps; and then from that face, second in the whole world, are made jugs, foot pans, a frying pan, chamber pots.’ See also the description by ‘Seneca’, at *Octavia* vv. 794–9, of the similar fate that befell statues of Poppaea.

²³ *Τῇ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Θεοφίλου σπουδῇ βασιλέως ἐκέλευε πρόσταγμα λύεσθαι τοὺς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ναοὺς... τὰ μὲν οὖν ἱερὰ κατεστρέφετο· τὰ δὲ ἀγάλματα τῶν θεῶν μετεχωνεύετο εἰς*

nature. Or were they? The epigram of Palladas dwells on precisely this question, which it frames as a kind of riddle and to which it offers a joking response.

Palladas clearly treats his subject here as a variation on ecphrastic norms: he contemplates an object, the *τήγανον*, a humble kitchen utensil (the word is at home in comedy),²⁴ and ponders its significance. Yet in this instance the meaning of the implement is predicated on its prior destruction and transformation out of a bronze Eros.²⁵ It is the altered object, along with the link between its present and past state, that interests the speaker. As commonly in ecphrasis, his contemplation results in an interpretation: the object's alienation from its former aspect and significance turns out to be only superficial. The smith's recasting was *οὐκ ἀλόγως* (v. 2). So why is a frying pan like the god of love? That is the question the speaker seems to ask. In answer, the epigram wittily—perhaps also ruefully—suggests a connection.²⁶

Palladas' focus on the metamorphosis of an artwork here is, I believe, deliberately and playfully evocative of his own creative process. For, like the bronze smith in the epigram, the poet has transformed a source (*μεταλλάξας*, v. 1) and created out of it something new (*ἐποίησε*, v. 1), though related. To my knowledge, it has not been recognized until now that Palladas drew for his poem on a famous passage from Anacreon:²⁷

λεβήτια, καὶ εἰς ἑτέρας χρείας τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας, τοῦ βασιλέως χαρισαμένου τοὺς θεοὺς εἰς δαπανήματα τῶν πτωχῶν.

²⁴ See LSJ s.v. *τάγηνον*.

²⁵ Does Palladas, by describing the smith's action as *μεταλλάξας* (v. 1), suggest an etymology of substances gotten from the mines, i.e. metals, *τὰ μέταλλα*?

²⁶ The essential similarity between divine statue and humble implement is a theme raised already by Philo of Alexandria in differentiating Jewish and pagan thought: 'But what about carved images and statues? Their substance is stone and wood, which until recently had been entirely shapeless. Stonecutters and woodcutters cut them out of their larger material, while their kindred and original parts have become urns and foot basins and other kinds of objects even less honourable, which serve functions in the shadows rather than those in the light' (*ἀλλὰ τοὺς τὰ ξόανα καὶ ἀγάλματα; ὧν αἱ οὐσαὶ λίθοι καὶ ξύλα, τὰ μέχρι πρὸ μικροῦ τελείως ἄμορφα, λιθοτόμων καὶ δρυσοτόμων τῆς συμφυΐας αὐτὰ διακοψάντων, ὧν τὰ ἀδελφὰ μέρη καὶ συγγενῆ λουτροφόροι γεγόνασι καὶ ποδόνιπτρα καὶ ἄλλα ἅττα τῶν ἀτιμοτέρων, ἃ πρὸς τὰς ἐν σκότῳ χρείας ὑπηρετεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ τὰς ἐν φωτί. De vita contemplativa 7.2–5).*

²⁷ It is worth noting that Anacreontic influence has been observed elsewhere in Palladas, for instance in AP 11.54, by Peek (1949), 167. It is striking, too, that there are multiple passages in the *Carmina Anacreontea* concerning metal images of Eros. In CA 4, for instance, the speaker tells a metalsmith to make a cup with Eros and Bathyllus on it: 'make vines for me, and grape-clusters on them, and make a vat of wine, and those treading the grapes in gold, and Eros and Bathyllus together with lovely Lyaeus' (*ποίησον ἀμπέλους μοι, | καὶ βότρυας κατ' αὐτῶν, | <ποίη δὲ ληνὸν οἶνον> | καὶ χρυσέους πατοῦντας | ὁμοῦ καλῶ Λυαῖφ | Ἐρωτα καὶ Βάθυλλον*, lines 12–21). Cf. CA 5.14: 'engrave weaponless Erotes' (*χάρασσ' Ἐρωτας ἀνόπλους*). The prospect of melting down an image of Eros is also present. Thus in CA 11 'a youth was selling an Eros made of wax' (*Ἐρωτα κήρινόν τις | νεηνίης ἐπώλει*, lines 1–2) and tells it: 'Eros, set me ablaze; but if you won't, you should melt in the fire' (*Ἐρως, σὺ δ' εὐθέως με | πύρωσον· εἰ δὲ μή, σὺ | κατὰ φλογὸς τικήσῃ*, lines 4–16).

μεγάλῳ δηῖτέ μ' Ἔρωσ ἔκοψεν ὥστε χαλκεὺς
 πελέκει, χειμερίῃ δ' ἔλουσεν ἐν χαράδρῃ.
 (Anacr. PMG 413)

Once more, like a smith, Eros battered me with his huge
 axe, and doused me in an icy torrent.

Eros himself is envisioned here as a brute, irresistible force, like a χαλκεὺς ('smith') who beats the speaker yet again into the desired shape and then tempers his erotic mettle (as it were) with a plunge into ice-cold water. Palladas—like the bronze smith in his poem—transforms Anacreon's striking image; and he does so by inverting it. The god, this time, is the object of violence (accusative Ἔρωτα in place of Anacreon's Ἔρωσ; reversal of Anacreon's order in subject and object: χαλκοτύπος τὸν Ἔρωτα ~ μ' Ἔρωσ). And rather than appearing as χαλκεὺς, Eros is now beaten into a new form by a χαλκοτύπος,²⁸ whose harsh τύπος doubtless picks up and varies Anacreon's ἔκοψεν. Significantly, Palladas also alters his source by taking what was just a comparison in Anacreon (ὥστε χαλκεὺς, v. 1) and making it 'real', a flesh-and-blood character in his poem, the χαλκοτύπος. Similarly, he takes the sublime, irresistible Eros of Anacreon and brings him down to earth, turning him into malleable base matter: bronze, the stuff of gods and . . . frying pans! Thus Palladas brazenly reworks his source with a coarse admixture of irony, wit, and rue, even as his χαλκοτύπος had turned a transcendent deity into a kitchen utensil.

Further epigrams by Palladas describe effigies of the gods that have suffered humiliating change.²⁹ Here I want to focus on a series of four—closely inter-related variations on a theme—on the goddess Tyche: AP 9.180–3. As before, the poet dwells not just on the transformed circumstances of the statue but on the relationship between its present and past state:

Τύχη καπηλεύουσα πάντα τὸν βίον,
 ἀσυγκέραστον τὴν φύσιν κεκτημένη,
 καὶ συγκυκῶσα καὶ μεταντλοῦσ' αὖ πάλιν
 καὐτὴ κάπηλός ἐστι νῦν τις, οὐ θεά,
 τέχνην λαχοῦσα τὴν τρόπων ἐπαξίαν.

(Pall. AP 9.180)

Fortune, who runs all life like a tavern,
 who possesses a nature like unmixed wine,
 who mixes things up and ladles them back out again,

²⁸ The artisan, moreover, appears at the start of the verse as opposed to Anacreon's χαλκεὺς at the end. Did Palladas want to distinguish a χαλκοτύπος from a χαλκεὺς, as Xenophon seems to do at HG 3.4.17 (cf. LSJ s.v. χαλκοτύπος)? If so, the difference is unclear to me. However, Maria Kanellou asks via email: 'If χαλκεὺς refers to someone who works with all kinds of metals (LSJ) (while χαλκοτύπος expresses specialization with copper), could it be used in Anacreon to show that Eros tortures all kind of men?'

²⁹ E.g. Pall. AP 282 on a statue of the Nikai; see A. Cameron (1964).

even she is now a tavern keeper rather than a goddess,
having acquired a trade that suits her vicissitudes.

ἀνεστράφησαν, ὥς ὁρῶ, τὰ πράγματα,
καὶ τὴν Τύχην νῦν δυστυχοῦσαν εἶδομεν.

(Pall. AP 9.181)

Things have been turned upside down, so I see,
and we now see Fortune suffering misfortune.

καὶ σύ, Τύχη δέσποινα, τύχην ἀτυχῇ πόθεν ἔσχες;
ἢ παρέχουσα τύχας πῶς ἀτυχῆς γέγονας;
μάνθανε καὶ σὺ φέρειν τὰ σὰ ρεύματα, καὶ σὺ διδάσκου
τὰς ἀτυχεῖς πτώσεις, ἃς παρέχεις ἑτέροις.

(Pall. AP 9.182)

Even you, Lady Fortune, how is it that you have suffered misfortune?
How have you, who furnish fortunes, become unfortunate?
Learn to bear your own twists of fate, and instruct yourself
in the unfortunate vicissitudes that you furnish for others.

καὶ σύ, Τύχη, λοιπὸν μεταβαλλομένη καταπαίζου,
μηδὲ τύχης τῆς σῆς ὕστατα φεισαμένη·
ἢ πρὶν νηὶν ἔχουσα καπηλεύεις μετὰ γῆρας,
θερμοδότης μερόπων νῦν ἀναφαινομένη.
νῦν ὁσίως στένε καὶ σὺ τεὸν πάθος, ἄστατε δαῖμον,
τὴν σὴν ὥς μερόπων νῦν μετάγουσα τύχην.

(Pall. AP 9.183)

So, Fortune, even you then are mocked for your altered circumstances,
and you have not even been spared the worst of your own fortune.
You who once had a temple now keep a tavern in your old age,
and appearing now in plain view you serve warm drinks to mortals.
So lament now reverently, even you, your own calamity, O shifting goddess,
now that you move your own fortune, just like that of mortals, from one
place to another.³⁰

The first two of these poems, in iambic trimeters, are descriptive; the second pair, in elegiacs, address the goddess directly. As a group, they suggest monument inscriptions, as they evoke the epigraphic practice of multiple thematically related poems engraved on the same dedication or tomb (*Parallelgedichte*). But if the poems suggest a monumental context in this way, they do so ironically, for they commemorate a monument that has been tainted—and they dwell on the taint.

³⁰ Translations adapted from Wilkinson (2010a, 181–2).

Until recently, our four epigrams were thought to describe a temple of Tyche (ἡ πρὶν νηὸν ἔχουσα, AP 9.183.3) that had been repurposed into a tavern.³¹ Now, however, Noel Lenski has suggested that Palladas was referring to a statue of Tyche, not a temple.³² It was, he argues, the one in Constantinople mentioned by John Lydus (τὴν ἱσταμένην ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ στήλην τῆς Τύχης, *On the Months* 4.132), whose Latin votive inscription (accurately reported by Lydus in Greek) still survives on the base of a monumental column;³³ Lydus says the ‘location’ was later turned into a tavern (ὁ δὲ τόπος ὕστερον καπηλείον ἐγένετο).³⁴ Concurring with Wilkinson’s redating of Palladas to the time of Constantine, Lenski assumes that Lydus’ reference to the ‘later’ makeover of the location (ὕστερον) was simply mistaken. In his view, since Palladas describes his Tyche as ἡ πρὶν νηὸν ἔχουσα (AP 9.183.3), her statue ‘may . . . have been moved from a temple to its new column, which was apparently located by a tavern. This would have made it yet another example of Constantine’s confiscation of cult images from around the Empire and their redeployment in his city. For a conservative pagan like Palladas, this was an affront to religious sensibilities’.³⁵

³¹ Bowra (1960b), 123, for instance, identifies it as the temple of Tyche at Alexandria, claiming that, ‘like another temple, at Constantinople (Ioh. Lyd. *de Mens.* 4. 132), it was turned into a καπηλείον or tavern’. His assumption here is that Palladas lived and worked in Egypt; the poet must thus have referred to an Alexandrian temple. Similarly, cf. Zerwes (1956), 269–70 and A. Cameron (1964), 57. No evidence, however, suggests that the Alexandrian temple of Tyche ever became a tavern. Most recently Cameron, while still claiming that Palladas’ four poems are ‘on a temple of Tyche turned into a tavern’, suggests that the temple could have been in other cities besides Constantinople, such as Antioch or Madaurus, way stations for Palladas ‘on the way there or back again’ from Alexandria (A. Cameron 2016, 103 and 105). Wilkinson (2010a), 181–5, likewise, initially saw the poems as referring to a converted shrine, though one in Constantinople. He changed his mind following Lenski, see next note.

³² Unpublished typescript, which the author shared with me. It was originally intended as part of Lenski (2016) but is now to be published in a different context. See also n. 35 here.

³³ *CIL* III 733 = *IK* 58.1 no. 15 = *ILS* 820 = *AE* 1999.1506. The inscription reads FORTUNAE | REDUCI OB | DEVICTOS GOTHOS. Mommsen (on *CIL* III, pp. 135–6) dates the inscription to Constantine’s defeat of the Goths in 332 CE, a date that has been widely accepted, though see Stichel (1999), 481–2, for other views and for an attempt to redate to the 510s.

³⁴ The whole passage from John Lydus’ *Mens.* 4.132 reads as follows: ‘the column of Tyche standing in Byzantium was erected by Pompey the Great. For having hemmed in Mithridates there along with the Goths, he dispersed them and captured Byzantium. And the inscription in Latin letters on the base of the column attests to this, proclaiming the following: “For Tyche who brings home safely, on account of the Goths who were defeated.” The location later became a tavern’ (ὅτι τὴν ἱσταμένην ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ στήλην τῆς Τύχης Πομπήσιος ὁ Μέγας ἐστήσεν· ἐνταῦθα <γὰρ> τὸν Μιθριδάτην συγκλείσας μετὰ τῶν Γότθων καὶ τούτους διασκεδάσας τὸ Βυζάντιον εἶλε· καὶ μαρτυρεῖ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς σπείρας τοῦ κίονος ἐπίγραμμα. Λατίνους γράμμασιν, ὃ δηλοῖ τάδε· τῇ Τύχῃ τῇ ἐπανασωστικῇ διὰ τοὺς νικηθέντας Γότθους. ὁ δὲ τόπος ὕστερον καπηλείον ἐγένετο.)

³⁵ Lenski, typescript. Wilkinson (2012), 45 n. 192 adopts Lenski’s identification of Palladas’ Tyche here as a statue set in Constantinople in the 330s. See also Wilkinson (2017), 274–5.

Lenski is, in my opinion, absolutely right to interpret the poems as referring to a statue of Tyche removed from its original site.³⁶ Strangely, however, he does not justify his interpretation through the language of the poems themselves, though in fact they emphatically bear him out, as I shall attempt to show.

First, all four poems—whether describing or addressing her directly—focus squarely on the figure of Tyche, mentioning her physical environment only secondarily (as in the subordinate clause, ἡ πρὶν νηὸν ἔχουσα, AP 9.183.3). Further, in conventional ecphrastic fashion, the second and fourth poems present her as an object of visual contemplation: ‘we now *see* the well-known Fortune suffering misfortune’ (καὶ τὴν Τύχην νῦν δυστυχοῦσαν εἶδομεν, AP 9.181.2);³⁷ ‘appearing now in plain view you serve warm drinks to mortals’ (θερμοδότης μερόπων νῦν ἀναφαινομένη, AP 9.183.4). Indeed, I wonder whether the phrase νῦν ἀναφαινομένη suggests that the figure of Tyche was previously in an enclosed space, such as the temple of the previous verse, but has now been removed to an open place, where all can see her. These visual evocations of the goddess strongly suggest a cult statue, not (one cannot emphasize enough) a temple.

The final two poems begin with the phrase καὶ σύ, Τύχη (‘even you, Tyche’). In the third poem alone (AP 9.182), the phrase recurs three times (twice in v. 3), where it belongs to a larger pattern of repetition, which makes manifest in words the ebb and flow of *changes*, ῥεύματα (v. 3), that Tyche undergoes³⁸ (thus e.g. in Τύχη . . . τύχην ἀτυχή, v. 1; τύχας . . . ἀτυχής, v. 2; ἀτυχεῖς, v. 4; or in how she becomes the recipient of change when previously she had been its source, πόθεν ἔσχες . . . παρέχουσα, vv. 1–2; φέρειν . . . παρέχεις, vv. 3–4). Those changes are figured also in the idea of πτώσεις (v. 4), which—given Palladas’ job as schoolmaster and following the imperatives μάθθαι and διδάσκειν—evokes the classroom, sardonically suggesting ‘declensions’, not just calamities: Τύχης ‘decline’ in this poem is captured in her declension through various cases and forms! This is a shift from how Tyche had earlier been described in literature.

³⁶ Given John Lydus’ testimony, I too find it plausible—though not necessary—that the statue was located in Constantinople. Lenski’s contention, however, that Constantine moved the statue to a location where a tavern already existed, in opposition to Lydus’ view that this establishment was a later development (ὕστερον), seems predicated only on his desire to support Wilkinson’s redating. There is no reason why Palladas could not have commented later on a conversion *after* the statue’s installation.

³⁷ Does the definite article in τὴν Τύχην suggest that Palladas was referring to an especially well-known statue of the goddess? Note also ὡς ὁρῶ in v. 1: the switch from singular to plural is plausibly construed inclusively, to allow Palladas’ readers to join in the act of seeing the goddess in their imagination.

³⁸ For ῥεῦμα in connection with τύχη, see Men. Georg. fr. 2 (see also LSJ s.v.): τὸ τῆς τύχης γὰρ ῥεῦμα μεταπίπτει ταχύ (‘for the tide of fortune quickly shifts’). The line was proverbial; it is quoted at Stob. 4.41.28 and by several late antique grammarians and commentators. Note the play here between τύχη and ταχύ (which seems to mirror Tyche’s verbal changes in Palladas).

Certainly she had always been inconstant and changeable, but that was in how she doled out fortunes to *others*.³⁹ Now she herself is subject to change.

As the first epigram stresses, she has suffered a great fall: at first only figuratively ‘running all life like a tavern’ (καπηλεύουσα πάντα τὸν βίον, AP 9.180.1),⁴⁰ she is by the end of the poem no longer a goddess, ‘having acquired a trade that suits her changes/vicissitudes’ (τέχνην λαχούσα τὴν τρόπων ἐπαξίαν, AP 9.180.5).⁴¹ That is, for Palladas, Τύχης metaphorical καπηλεύειν (vv. 1–3) is transformed into concrete reality:⁴² she is now actually a κάπηλος, a sleazy tavern keeper, the lowest of the low (καὐτὴ κάπηλός ἐστι νῦν τις, οὐ θεά, AP 9.180.4).⁴³

In the final poem of the series (AP 9.183), her transformation is figured spatially. She is invoked with a traditional epithet as ἄστατε δαίμων (v. 5).⁴⁴ But while previously she handed out fortunes that were unsteady, now it is the goddess herself who is unsteady in her fortune. Indeed, in this context the epithet may suggest a statue that had previously been fixed in a particular place, a temple (ἢ πρὶν νηὸν ἔχουσα, v. 3), but has now been set elsewhere. That

³⁹ See for instance Demetrius of Phalerum’s treatise *Peri Tyches*, which describes Tyche as ‘not willing to tie herself down by treaty with regard to all human life, changing everything contrary to what we had calculated, and revealing her power in the unexpected’ (ἢ πρὸς τὸν βίον ἡμῶν ἀσύνθετος τύχη καὶ πάντα παρὰ [τὸν] λογισμὸν τὸν ἡμέτερον καινοποιοῦσα καὶ τὴν αὐτῆς δύναμιν ἐν τοῖς παραδόξοις ἐνδεικνυμένη, quoted at Plb. 29.21.5).

⁴⁰ The metaphor is already present at Plu. *De Is. et Os.* 369c, where we hear that ‘none of those things that nature brings here is unmixed, nor is there one steward who out of two different casks dispensing human affairs like liquids mixes them like a tavern keeper together for us’ (μᾶλλον δὲ μηδὲν ὡς ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν ἄκρατον ἐνταῦθα τῆς φύσεως φερούσης οὐ δυοῖν πίθων εἰς ταμίας ὥσπερ νάματα τὰ πράγματα καπηλικῶς διανεμῶν ἀνακεράννυσιν ἡμῖν), but rather that there are two separate and opposite powers dispensing fortunes to the world. It is interesting that Plutarch here uses the famous passage from *Il.* 24.527 about the two *pithoi* of Zeus and adapts it to the image of the tavern keeper!

⁴¹ Did Palladas play here on the Menandrian sententia Τύχη τέχνην ὥρθωσεν, οὐ τέχνη τύχην (‘Fortune has exalted art, not art fortune’, 740 Jaekel)? Rather than raising on high a τέχνη, Palladas’ Tyche has herself been humiliated by getting this τέχνη as her lot. For wordplay on τύχη/τέχνη, cf. already TrGF 1.39 Agathon F 6: τέχνη τύχην ἔστερξε καὶ τύχη τέχνην (‘art loves fortune and fortune art’).

⁴² Recall how, at AP 9.773, Palladas similarly turned Anacreon’s simile about Eros ὥσπερ χαλκεύς (PMG 413.1) into the concrete character of the χαλκοτύπος.

⁴³ Already in Herodotus tavern keeping appears as a terrible degradation, which makes one incapable of manly action: Croesus suggests that Cyrus punish the rebellious Lydians by having them henceforth teach their children only to play the lyre, to dance, and to keep taverns (πρόειπε δ’ αὐτοῖσι καθαρίζειν τε καὶ ψάλλειν καὶ καπηλεύειν παιδεύειν τοὺς παῖδας, Hdt. 1.155).

⁴⁴ See already the adespota TrGF 2 F 179 = ‘Men.’ monost. 82 Jaekel: ἀνώμαλοι πλάστιγγες ἀστάτου τύχης (‘the precarious scales [or kottabos disk] of unsteady fortune’). For the instability of Tyche, see also e.g. Epicur. *Ep.* 3 p. 65 U, Arist. *Ep.* 4.4, Ph. *De providentia* fr. 2.34.4, D.S. 34/5 28.3.10, S. E. M. 11.208.8. Cf. Eus. *PE* 6.8.22: τὴν Τύχην· ἣς τὸ εὐμετάβολον καὶ ἄστατον καὶ νῦν μὲν οὕτως, νῦν δὲ οὕτως ἔχον ἐνδείξασθαι βουλόμενοι, εἰδωλοποιήσαντες τὸ ποῖον τοῦτο σύμπτωμα τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπὶ σφαίρας βεβηκυῖαν τὴν Τύχην ἔδειξαν (‘Fortune: and of this last they wished to indicate the changefulness and instability, and its turning now this way and now that; and to show this kind of casualty in affairs by an image, they represented Fortune as standing on a globe’). Eusebius was Palladas’ near contemporary.

interpretation is borne out in the poem's last verse, which describes this divinity as 'now moving your own fortune, just like that of mortals, from one place to another' (τὴν σὴν ὡς μερόπων νῦν μετάγουσα τύχην, AP 9.183.6). Until now scholars have not given due weight to the meaning of the participle μετάγουσα, 'conveying from one place to another'.⁴⁵ But, taken seriously, it tells us that Fortune changed locations: the divinity had to move her Tyche (τὴν σὴν... τύχην), that is, her statue, to a new and demeaning address.

As a final Palladan instance of a statue's misfortune, I want to discuss an ecphrasis on a bronze image of Heracles:

τὸν Διὸς ἐν τριόδοισιν ἐθαύμασα χάλκεον υἱά,
 τὸν πρὶν ἐν εὐχολαῖς, νῦν παραιπιτόμενον.
 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρ' ἔειπον· Ἀλεξίκακε τρισέληνε,
 μηδέποθ' ἥττηθεις σήμερον ἐξετάθης;
 νυκτὶ δὲ μειδιῶν με θεὸς προσέειπε παραστάς·
 'Καίρῳ δουλεύειν καὶ θεὸς ὦν ἔμαθον.'

5

(Pall. AP 9.441)

I marvelled at the bronze son of Zeus at the crossroads,
 formerly an object of prayers, now torn down on the ground.
 Indignant, I spoke: 'Protector from ills, child of three nights,
 never defeated, are you laid flat on a single day?'
 But at night the god stood beside me and smiling addressed me:
 'God though I am, I have learned to serve the times.'

It may be illuminating to set this account of Heracles' image overthrown and left lying at the crossroads in counterpoint with a tale from another time and place regarding the assault on a bronze effigy of this same hero. In his oration against Gaius Verres (2.4.94–5) in 70 BCE, more than four centuries before Palladas' epigram, Cicero describes how Verres' men tried to pull down a particularly fine bronze statue of Heracles from the Temple of Heracles near the agora of Agrigentum. Cicero says he has never seen a more beautiful statue of Heracles (*non... vidisse pulchrius*, 2.4.94), and that its mouth and chin are worn down because worshippers have kissed these parts in thanksgiving and prayer (*in precibus et gratulationibus*, 2.4.94, cf. Palladas' τὸν πρὶν ἐν εὐχολαῖς, v. 2). The orator draws out the scene of attack into two dramatic phases. First, Verres' retinue of armed slaves overcomes the temple watchmen and custodians, forces open the doors, and 'tries to pull down the statue and cause it to fall using levers' (*demoliri signum ac vectibus labefactare conantur*, 2.4.94).

⁴⁵ LSJ s.v. μετάγω. In his Loeb, for instance, Paton translates the line thus: 'now that thou reversest thine own fortune like that of mortals'. Cf. Beckby (1957–8) ad loc., *nun dir zerbrochen dein Glück, wie du es Menschen zerbrachst*, and Wilkinson (2010a), 182, 'now that you, just like mortals, suffer your own change in fortune'. All miss the connotation of changing place.

This is followed by the quick arrival of the general populace, which raced to the temple in defence of its god, even while the very numerous attackers had been labouring unsuccessfully for more than an hour to overthrow the statue, some using levers (again!), some tugging on ropes tied about all its limbs. But (miraculously) the statue ‘did not waver at all in the meantime’ (*illud interea nulla lababat ex parte*, 2.4.95)! When finally the attackers are driven away, an approving Cicero reports how the Sicilians interpret the event with characteristic wit—through a play on the name of Verres—as a further labour of Heracles against ‘a boar [*verrem*] no less monstrous than the one from Erymanthus’ (*non minus hunc immanissimum verrem quam illum aprum Erymanthium*, 2.4.95). In other words, the statue is understood to have been saved through the divine agency of Heracles himself (in league with his worshippers). His sacred status and superhuman power is taken for granted by all except the sacrilegious Verres and his henchmen. What a world of difference stands between this description and that of Palladas!

Yet that difference might not be initially apparent, as one starts to read the epigram. For at first blush nothing seems to be amiss with this Heracles. As before, we find conventions of ecphrasis. The speaker marvels at an artwork (*ἐθαύμασα* v. 1, cf. the ecphrastic gesture also in Cicero: *simulacrum ipsius Herculis, quo non facile dixerim quicquam me vidisse pulchrius*, ‘an image of Hercules himself; I could not easily say that I have seen any more beautiful’, 2.4.94) and describes his reaction to it, here in the form of a modified dialogue epigram (Heracles’ reply is delayed, coming later that night in a dream).⁴⁶ At the outset of the poem, then, nothing suggests that the statue is not intact. Indeed, the language of the epigram could be construed as not referring to a statue at all, but to a living, thriving hero, *χάλκεον υἱά* meaning simply ‘Zeus’ ‘strong son’.

But with verse 2 Palladas comes to his theme: the artwork defaced. Previously an object of prayers and vows, *εὐχολαῖς* (recall how in Cicero he had been venerated *in precibus et gratulationibus*, 2.4.94), Heracles has now been torn down, *παρариπτόμενον*. Perhaps we should see in the statue’s setting a reference to the famous story by Prodicus (as transmitted by Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 2.1.21–34) about Heracles at the crossroads, in which the hero had to choose between the difficult road to virtue (*arete*) and the easy path to vice (*kakia*). Now laid flat at the crossroads, Heracles can no longer serve as model for that virtuous choice. Indeed, god though he is, he no longer enjoys the protection of his community, as he had at Agrigentum: only the solitary speaker of the epigram is indignant at all (a narratorial counterpart to Cicero expressing outrage at Verres’ depredations) and laments his fall. Reacting with a formula that epic heroes use in deep vexation when addressing their own

⁴⁶ See Kassel (1983) and Rasche (1910).

thumos to exhort themselves to action (ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρ' ἔειπον),⁴⁷ the speaker addresses the hero in terms that stress his divinity as the one who wards off evil, Ἀλεξίκακε, as the child begotten in the miraculous three nights' lovemaking of Amphitryon and Alcmene, τρισέληνε, and as a hero never defeated, μηδέποθ' ἡττηθείς (AP 9.441.3–4). But as though the power of the god is no longer present in his statue, now merely a fallen idol, Heracles is unable to reply.

In the final couplet, however, the god—smiling—appears to the speaker in a dream. His words, like his smile, are mysterious: 'God though I am, I have learned to serve the times', in other words the *καιρός*. Is this an admission of defeat, or a survival strategy for a tumultuous age? Does his smile express resignation, or a divinity's shrewd resistance? So far as I can see, no one has noted that Heracles' words here closely echo those he speaks near the end of the Euripidean tragedy that bears his name: 'Now, as it seems, I've got to serve necessity' (νῦν δ', ὡς ἔοικε, τῇ τύχῃ δουλευτέον, v. 1357). Interestingly, in Euripides these words come just as the title character has embraced his humanity, his *mortal* parentage through Amphitryon rather than Zeus, and resolved to endure in life rather than despair. This choice is accompanied by tears, the hero's first ever: 'I did not think I would ever come to this pass, that I would shed tears from my eyes' (οὐδ' ἂν ῥόμην ποτέ | ἐς τοῦθ' ἰκέσθαι, δάκρυ' ἀπ' ὀμμάτων βαλεῖν, vv. 1355–6).⁴⁸ In Palladas, by contrast, he smiles and remains clearly and emphatically a god (both as described by the speaker, θεός, v. 5; and in his own words, θεὸς ὢν, v. 6). Perhaps, then, like his Euripidean counterpart, he endures, but this time as a god. And his appearance in the dream possibly suggests that his power, like that of the Olympian gods in the epigram of Palladas examined previously, has migrated to a more remote location than the crossroads. In this he is the servant of the times, of the *καιρός*, which Palladas substitutes for Euripides' *τύχη*. Despite the toppled statue, then, does Palladas view the god as down but not out?

Be that as it may, Palladas, like Heracles, is a servant of the *καιρός*, the particular moment he lived in, inasmuch as he adapted traditions of ecphrasis to describe something new, a troubling phenomenon of his turbulent time: the disfigurement and transformation of divine statues.

⁴⁷ Cf. e.g. *Il.* 11.403, 17.90, 21.552, 22.98, and *Od.* 5.464.

⁴⁸ On this passage and the issue of Heracles' tears in tragedy, see Suter (2009), 67. On tears and emotions in epigram, see Meyer's chapter in this volume.

Art, Nature, Power

Garden Epigrams from Nero to Heraclius

Steven D. Smith

1. INTRODUCTION

Epigrams grace the gardens of the powerful, and the gardens of the powerful have been memorialized in anthologies of epigrams. The very terminology of garlands and anthologies (collections of flowers) announces the garden as a figure for epigram itself, and so epigrams on gardens from imperial palaces or spaces associated with the emperor signal the intervention of power in the poetic as well as in the horticultural art. The poems on which this chapter focuses are all commentaries on the emperor (or his ecclesiastical surrogate, in the case of the final example) as an aesthete and artist who exerts his worldly power over nature and who wishes for that power to be commemorated in verse. The first of the epigrams is skoptic, and the rest are ecphrastic. These garden epigrams also chart the centripetal movement of Christianity from the first century CE to the seventh, within both Roman thought and imperial space. Verses on imperial gardens were not an established subgenre of epigram, in the sense that they were never collected and classified as such, either in antiquity or in the Byzantine period. But reading these poems together as a micro-collection offers a valuable opportunity for gauging how the epigram form reflects, over time, the changes in Roman thinking about the intersection of art and nature in the presence of imperial power.

2. NERO'S GARDENS AND THE ART OF DEATH

ἐκ τῶν Ἐσπερίδων τῶν τοῦ Διὸς ἡρὲ Μενίσκος
ὥς τὸ πρὶν Ἡρακλῆς χρύσεια μῆλα τρία.
καὶ τί γάρ; ὥς ἐάλω, γέγονεν μέγα πᾶσι θέαμα
ὥς τὸ πρὶν Ἡρακλῆς ζῶν κατακαίμενος.
(Lucill. AP 11.184)

From the Hesperides of Zeus Meniscus lifted,
 just like Heracles once upon a time, three golden apples.
 And of course! Since he was captured, he became a great spectacle for
 everyone, just like Heracles once upon a time, when he was burned alive.¹

Lucilius' epigram emphatically likens a certain Meniscus to Heracles, both for his theft of golden apples from the Hesperides and for his being burned alive. Though the identity of Meniscus remains a mystery, the interpretation of Jacobs, later developed by Louis Robert, has been influential: Meniscus was a real thief, who was caught in the Horti Sallustiani, the imperial gardens of Nero's Domus Aurea (here mythologically transformed into 'the Hesperides of Zeus') and condemned to execution by *crematio* ('immolation').² Indirectly, then, Lucilius' epigram is as much about Nero (r. 54–68 CE)—the Zeus of the gardens³—as it is about the failed thief Meniscus,⁴ and the poem functions as a wry commentary on what the emperor himself would have thought to be an ingenious invention of a theatrically satisfying and mythologically apt punishment to suit Meniscus' crime.

Gideon Nisbet introduces the possibility that Meniscus was a Christian, thereby connecting this epigram with the historiographical evidence that Nero burned Christians alive as a public spectacle.⁵ According to Tacitus, these executions were 'farces' and Nero 'had offered his own gardens for that spectacle'.⁶ If this is indeed the background for AP 11.184, then Meniscus need not have actually been a thief; rather 'the mythic element of the theft of the apples will have been stage-managed (however farcically) to provide a narrative rationale for Meniscus' immolation in the Gardens'.⁷ Nisbet

¹ The texts of the epigrams in this chapter are from volumes 8 and 10 of the Budé edition of the *Anthologie grecque*; all translations are my own.

² Jacobs (1794–1814), 2: 473 and Robert (1968), followed by Aubreton (2002), 261–2; Rozema (1971), 190; Coleman (1990), 60–1, and Nisbet (2003), 123–7. Griffin (1984), 271 n. 80 and 273 n. 31 finds this interpretation 'implausible'. Coleman has posited that Meniscus need not have actually stolen anything but could merely have been a trespasser in Nero's garden, and therefore guilty of treason (*maiestas*). For evidence of the gardens in the Domus Aurea, see Tac. *Ann.* 15.42 and Suet. *Ner.* 31.2. Weinreich (1928), 44 has suggested that the gardens in question were the Horti Sallustiani. See also Wiedemann (1992), 85–9, who suggests an analogy between the poisoned coat given to Heracles by Deianeira and the *tunica molesta*, a garment soaked in pitch and worn by those condemned to death by *crematio*. Guarducci (1969) finds no testimony for the emperor's gardens being called 'the Gardens of the Hesperides', and in consequence supposes that the apples were stolen from a figurative representation of the nymphs, probably from a temple of Zeus—in which case this epigram would belong with other epigrams on temple thefts. Nisbet (2003), 126 counters this view, but Floridi (2014a), 351–3 is right that Guarducci's interpretation need not preclude the placement of the putative statue group within the imperial gardens, and in any case the nymphs known as the Hesperides were in the mythic imagination closely associated with the gardens over which they presided.

³ Aubreton (2002), 261–2; Floridi (2014a), 350–4.

⁴ Floridi (2014a), 352–3.

⁵ Nisbet (2003), 123–7.

⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 15.44.

⁷ Nisbet (2003), 127. Floridi (2014a), 351 n. 355 is sceptical on the grounds that the phrase *ὡς ἐάλω* ('since he was captured', v. 3) seems to give an explicit indication that the spectacle took

concludes that, if this interpretation is correct, ‘then it does not appear in any way critical of the Emperor. On the contrary, it highlights his inventiveness as *munerarius*, impresario.’ Indeed, as Lucia Floridi notes, Martial’s *On the Spectacles* (*De spectaculis*) offers a number of similar mythological travesties, and ‘a central theme of these epigrams is the capacity of the ruler to realize the myth’.⁸

I am not convinced, however, that Lucillius’ epigram is entirely celebratory of Nero’s artistic staging of this particular, fatal charade. Though Nero may have thought that the punishment would be theatrically satisfying for himself and his guests, it would not exactly have been an accurate staging, for Heracles’ immolation in myth famously resulted from his wearing of the robe poisoned by Deianeira with the blood of the centaur Nessus, and had nothing to do with his theft of the apples from the garden of the Hesperides. Because Nero’s self-professed theatrical flair (or flare, in this instance) comes at the cost of mythological accuracy, Lucillius’ satiric humour targets the childish carelessness of the emperor’s dramaturgical enthusiasm.

Moreover, the tone in these four verses is deeply ironic. First, there is nuance in the rhetorical question *καὶ τί γάρ;* at the beginning of the third verse, which I have translated as the exclamation ‘And of course!’. The question is elliptical, implying *ἄλλο* to mean ‘and what else?’. Given the context here (how myth determines thinking about crime and punishment), the utterance suggests that, while the speaker may have accepted the premise of a condemned man forced to play the role of a Heracles stealing golden apples from the garden of a Zeus-like emperor, the fatal sequel to the charade strains narrative belief.⁹ The form of Meniscus’ execution, in other words, has been so predetermined by the Heracles myth that (‘of course!’) there can be no other outcome than his immolation, even if in myth Heracles did *not* die as a result of his theft of the apples. The compressed rhetorical question implying the apparent inevitability of Meniscus’ fate barely conceals the speaker’s contempt for the facile mentality that has produced this spectacular form of justice. But, at the imperial court, the only logic that matters is Nero’s, and it is up to the audience to applaud the folly of his spectacle, even if that spectacle fails to make sense according to the accepted myth.

Then there is the repetition of *ὥς τὸ πρὶν Ἡρακλέης* in the second and fourth verses. At one level, as Floridi notes, the repetition emphasizes the two

place *after* the thief’s capture. But if, in the charade, the thief was made to perform the theft before his immolation, then the *μέγα...θέαμα* (‘great spectacle’, v. 3), the immolation itself, may be interpreted as the climax to the whole theatrical charade.

⁸ Floridi (2014a), 352: *Tema centrale di questi epigrammi è la capacità del sovrano di reificare il mito.*

⁹ On this interpretation of the elliptical question, see Denniston (1954), 85. Various other translations fail to convey this sense: cf. ‘Well, what happened?’ (Paton 1916–18, 2: 161); *Et alors?* (Aubretton 2002, 138); ‘Why so?’ (Coleman 1990, 59); ‘And so?’ (Nisbet 2003, 123).

different episodes of the mythical charade that assimilate the character to Heracles.¹⁰ At another level, though, such heavy-handed insistence on the analogy between Meniscus and his mythological counterpart simultaneously silences any possible objection and highlights the simple-mindedness with which the impresario produced his charade. Lucillius may even be here a wicked ventriloquist of Nero the *artifex* as the latter regaled the audience in his garden with the hysterical refrain ‘Just like Heracles once upon a time!’. We know from Suetonius that epigrams critical of Nero’s artistic pretensions were circulating in Rome and that the emperor was aware of this fact, and Lucillius himself wrote at least one other epigram lampooning the emperor as artist.¹¹ Even if, because of his supreme authority, he must be acknowledged as the Zeus of his garden, Nero is nevertheless not an object of praise but a subtle target of ridicule in this epigram. While Lucillius may seem to be applauding Nero’s mythologically conceived spectacle of *crematio*, it is easy to hear, in this overdone praise, a skoptic critique of bad art.¹²

3. JUSTINIAN’S GARDEN BY THE SEA

If Nero is the uncontested master of his palatial garden, then skoptic epigram is the vehicle for articulating wry commentary on the emperor’s use of the garden as performance space. Moving forward five centuries to the reign of Justinian (r. 527–565 CE), we see that the garden is still a site for contesting the emperor’s artistic style, but the poets of this age abandon the critical voice of skoptic epigram in their treatment of imperial themes.¹³ For their own epigrams on the emperor’s garden, they compose ecphrases instead, thereby claiming authority for themselves in the way they read the imperial landscape.¹⁴

¹⁰ Floridi (2014a), 355.

¹¹ Suet. *Ner.* 39 and *AP* 11.185, on which see Nisbet (2003), 118–23.

¹² For skoptic epigrams, see also the chapters by Floridi, Campbell, and Romero in this volume; in addition, see Kanellou’s chapter for mythological burlesque and satire in epigram.

¹³ What remains of the skoptic fifth book of the *Cycle* suggests that the collection did not have a political edge: *AP* 11.198, 11.350, 11.352, 11.354, 11.365–70, 11.372, 11.374–6, 11.379, 11.380, 11.382, and 16.314. See Mattsson (1942), 89–102.

¹⁴ By ecphrasis I do not mean exclusively a description of a work of art, which is a modern definition of the term; rather, I have in mind the definition of ecphrasis from classical rhetorical theory, as any vivid description that conjures in the reader’s mind an experience or perception of a person, place, time, or event. Cf. Hermog. *Prog.* 10.1 Rabe^a; Aelius Theon p. 118.7 Spengel; Aphthonius vol. 10, p. 36.2 Rabe^b. For a complete discussion of ecphrasis in classical and late antique rhetorical education, see James and Webb (1991), 4–7 and Webb (2009), 39–60. On ecphrastic epigram generally, see Gutzwiller (2002); Männlein-Robert (2007b), 37–81; and Bing’s chapter in this volume.

In the second quarter of the sixth century CE, Emperor Justinian ordered the construction of a magnificent new palace on the coast of Asia Minor. The palace was situated on a peninsula that jutted out into the waters of the Bosphorus, known in former times as Heraion, after a temple of Hera located on the site, but in Justinian's day known as Hieron or Hiereion. In addition to the palace, Justinian built at Hieron a church in honour of the Theotokos as well as a garden right on the shore that intermingled land and sea and undoubtedly afforded views of the water and the imperial city on the opposite coast.¹⁵ Though the palace, church, and garden no longer exist, an anonymous epigram that was once inscribed on or near the entrance to the garden has survived:

τοῦτον Ἰουστινιανὸς ἀγακλέα δέϊματο χώρον
 ὕδατι καὶ γαίῃ κάλλος ἐπικρεμάσας.
 (anon. AP 9.820)

Justinian built this glorious place,
 overlaying water and earth with beauty.

Justinian's beautification of Hieron is the achievement of an elemental harmony, unifying land and sea.¹⁶ This detail connects the imperial inscription with a series of four other contemporary epigrams, two of them composed by Paul the Silentiary and the others by Agathias and Arabius Scholasticus each. All four of these poems have been transmitted as part of a sequence from Book 9 of the *Greek Anthology* (AP 9.663–5, 667), though they were originally part of the *Cycle* of Agathias.¹⁷ The first three are 'on a garden by the sea' (εἰς κήπον προάλιον), while the fourth one, by Arabius, is 'on a suburban estate' (εἰς προάστειον).

The epigrams on the imperial garden at Hieron illustrate a process of generic transformation described by Kathryn Gutzwiller, in which the speaking voice in poems on art gradually shifted over time from the work of art

¹⁵ For the palace and its grounds, see Procop. *Aed.* 1.11.16–17; Janin (1964), 148–50; Angelova (2015), 159. On Byzantine gardens generally, see Maguire (2000) and Littlewood (2002), though neither discusses the garden at Hieron or its epigrams.

¹⁶ Janin (1964), 148–9; Cameron and Cameron (1966b), 10; Waltz and Soury (1974), 179 n. 1; Greco (2013), 255–6. AP 9.821, composed for the same site, offers no commentary on the garden itself. Cf. AP 9.698, from the Cilician city of Mopsuestia.

¹⁷ Brunck (1785), 3: 242; Jacobs (1794–1814); Veniero (1916), 177–8; Viansino (1963), 58–60; Cameron and Cameron (1966b), 10; Viansino (1967), 80–1; Waltz and Soury (1974), 130 n. 3, 131 n. 3; Schulte (2006), 14; Greco (2013), 257–9. On Agathias' *Cycle* generally, see A. M. Cameron (1970), 12–29. The lemmata for AP 9.663 to 9.665 and 9.667 are generic and lack the specificity of the lemma for AP 9.820, which was clearly inscribed on or near the entrance to the park at Hieron. It is possible that all five epigrams refer to the same site, though it appears that only the anonymous epigrams were actually inscribed at the park. L. Garland (2011), 147 hypothesizes that all the poems 'were submitted for competitive examination and that only one of them may have been selected for public display'. Other garden poems from the *Cycle* are AP 9.666, 9.668, and 9.669.

itself or its artisan to the viewer.¹⁸ While the imperial inscription employs a third-person voice that celebrates Justinian as the artisan responsible for imposing *κάλλος* over land and sea, the poems by Paul the Silentiary (AP 9.663 and 9.664) shift from a celebration of the artist and his work to a viewer's interpretation of the garden's artistic landscape. In consequence, Paul's epigrams constitute a literary substitute for first-hand experience of the garden and could take on a life of their own, independent of the garden. The poems by Agathias (AP 9.665) and Arabius (AP 9.667) also represent experiences in viewing similar to those expressed in Paul's poems, but they ascribe the speaking voice to the garden itself, thereby authorizing the viewer's interpretation by means of the testimony of the artistic landscape. Even though by conjuring the garden as a speaking object Agathias and Arabius look back to the earliest forms of inscriptional epigram, they nevertheless remain poets of ecphrasis and act as interpreters of that which is on display; telling the story of the place (as they see it), they necessarily bring to their dynamic impressions their own ideological points of view. Consequently, as we shall see, the imperial inscription and the epigrams from Agathias' *Cycle* represent starkly different ideas about power, aesthetics, pagan culture, and the role of poetry in public life: ideas that were relevant and still being contested in Byzantium in the sixth century CE.

4. PAUL'S EPIGRAMS: A VISITOR'S IMPRESSIONS

πόντος ὑποκλύζει χθονὸς ἔδρανα, πλωτὰ δὲ χέρσου
 νῶτα θαλασσαίοις ἄλσσει τηλεθάει.
 ὥς σοφὸς ὅστις ἔμμε βυθὸν χθονί, φύκια κήποις,
 Νηϊάδων προχοαῖς χεύματα Νηρεΐδων.

(Paul. Sil. AP 9.663)

The sea washes from below the seats of the earth, and the navigable
 back of dry land abounds in the sea's groves.

How clever the one who mingled the depth of the sea with the earth,
 seaweed with gardens, with the Naiads' outpourings the streams of the Nereids.

The first poem by Paul, an ecphrasis in four verses from the point of view of an admiring onlooker, begins with the description of the sea washing the 'seats of the earth from below' (v. 1), as the meeting of land and sea serves as the poet's primary focus. Paul achieves a sense of the mingling of the two elements by juxtaposing two adjective-noun pairs, in the nominative and dative cases respectively. The adjectives themselves are surprising descriptors for their corresponding nouns: in the poet's imagination the surface of the land

¹⁸ Gutzwiller (2002), 86.

becomes a place where one might unexpectedly find the passage of a boat (πλωτὰ δὲ χέρσου | νῶτα, vv. 1–2), while in this particular site the groves belong not to dry land but to the sea (θαλασσαίοις ἄλσεσι, v. 2).¹⁹ The third verse celebrates the *sophia* of the unnamed artisan who crafted this site.²⁰ Astonishment at the blending of *techne* and *phusis* is a common place in epichrastic epigram,²¹ but Paul offers a variation: the clever *mixis* of land and sea (vv. 3–4, see ἔμιξε).²² The poet illustrates the intermingling of elements in the second half of the third verse by juxtaposing four nouns, alternatively in the accusative and dative cases (βυθὸν χθονί, φύκια κήποις). The final verse continues to emphasize the landscape designer's *mixis* of land and marine elements through chiastic word order: the artisan has blended 'with the Naiads' outpourings the streams of the Nereids'. The phrase refers to the intermingling of fresh water and salt water,²³ and the blending of these two distinct but visually similar liquids is nicely illustrated by the repetition of *Nη-* (*nē-*) and *-ων* (*-ōn*) at the beginning and end of the nymphs' names. Paul's figurative language in the final verse of this epigram is echoed in the full-blown mythological fantasies of the subsequent poem:

ἐνθάδ' ἐριδμαίνουσι τίνος πλέον ἔπλετο χῶρος,
 Νύμφαι Νηιάδες, Νηρεΐς, Ἀδρυσάδες·
 ταῖς δὲ θεμιστεύει μεσάτη Χάρις οὐδὲ δικάζειν
 οἶδεν, ἐπεὶ ξυνὴν τέρψιν ὁ χῶρος ἔχει.
 (Paul. Sil. AP 9.664)

Here Nymphs compete over whose place it is more:

Naiads, Nereids, Hamadryads.

And Charis as mediator declares for them what is lawful, but how to rule

she does not know, since the place possesses delight to which they all contribute.

Paul's second ecphrasis, also in four verses, again represents the perspective of an admiring visitor to the garden, though the mode of expression shifts from descriptive to interpretive: the poem is less an objective observation (as AP 9.663) than a subjective reading of the landscape. Whereas the preceding poem emphasized the landscape designer's *sophia* in intermingling sea and land, this poem begins by situating the reader or viewer amid a scene of strife: three factions of nymphs are in contention over the ownership of the site. The indirect question 'whose place it is more?' (v. 1) provides the epigram with its theme. In the second verse, the asyndetic juxtaposition of Naiads, Nereids, and

¹⁹ Veniero (1916), 178–9; Viansino (1963), 60.

²⁰ On philosophical *sophia* in epigram, see Romero's chapter in this volume.

²¹ Mattsson (1942), 83.

²² On land and sea in sepulchral epigram, see Tueller's chapter in this volume.

²³ Waltz and Soury (1974), 130 n. 3.

Hamadryads suggests the urgency of their contest,²⁴ as now the nymphs of fresh water and salt water are joined by the nymphs of the trees. In the third verse the poet introduces Charis, who presides as mediator to declare what is lawful and right in the dispute of the nymphs.²⁵ But the poet denies his readers the satisfaction of a final judgement; for, in a humorous turn at the end of the epigram, Charis does not know how to rule in the case, since the place possesses a 'delight to which they all contribute' (*ξυνὴν τέρψιν*, v. 4). The *eris* of the nymphs is therefore counterbalanced by the *terpsis* that can only exist through their equal contributions. In fact, Paul's mythological fantasia is a variation on the theme of the judgement of Paris, which appears in several of his other epigrams;²⁶ here, however, he transfers the contest between the traditional three goddesses to the mingling of three natural elements in the landscape of the garden.

In the first official inscription from Hieron, the anonymous court poet explicitly names Justinian as the agent who overlaid land and sea with beauty (*κάλλος*). Though the *terpsis* of this poem is to be connected with the *kallos* of the earlier inscription, Paul here, in stark contrast to what he does in his own preceding poem, avoids any reference to the artisan responsible for this delight. Indeed, the very question of authority, expressed in this poem in juridical language (*θεμιστεύει*, *μεσάτη*,²⁷ and *δικάζειν*), is removed from human hands and placed in the hands of divine Charis. The beauty of the garden at Hieron, proclaimed in the official inscription as Justinian's imposition of a unifying mantle of *kallos*, is reimaged in Paul's second epigram as elemental equilibrium, suspending the reader between factiousness and aesthetic delight.

5. THE EPIGRAMS OF AGATHIAS AND ARABIOUS: THE GARDEN SPEAKS

εἶξον ἐμοί, Δάφνης ἱερὸν κλέτας, ἔκτοθι πόντου
 κείμενον, ἀγραύλου κάλλος ἐρημοσύνης.
 ἐνθάδε γὰρ Νύμφαι δεινδρίτιδες αἵ τ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ
 Νηρείδες ξυνὴν θέντο συνηλυσίην·
 ἀμφ' ἐμὲ γὰρ μάρναντο· δίκασσε δὲ Κυανοχαίτης
 καὶ με παρ' ἀμφοτέραις μέσσον ἔθηκεν ὄρον.

5

(Agath. AP 9.665)

²⁴ Viansino (1963), 60.

²⁵ Was there a statue of Charis in the park? See Veniero (1916), 179; Waltz and Soury (1974), 261.

²⁶ AP 5.234, 5.272, 5.301; I am indebted to Maria Kanellou for this observation.

²⁷ On the substantive *μέσματος* as 'arbitrator', see LSJ, which cites a fragment from the sixth century CE (P. Klein. Form. 402).

Yield to me, sacred hillside of Daphne, situated far from
 the sea, a beauty of rustic solitude.
 For here Nymphs of the trees and the Nereids in the sea
 have placed their shared assembly.
 For they contended over me. And the Dark-Haired One has ruled
 and has placed me as a middle boundary for both sides.

The forensic dimension of Paul's epigram surely appealed to the *scholastikos* Agathias. Unlike Paul's epigram, however, the speaking voice in Agathias' poem is not a nameless observer but the garden itself, which begins the poem by addressing the 'sacred hillside of Daphne' and commanding it to yield as a place of unmatched beauty (vv. 1–2). The grove of Daphne at Antioch was famous, and its beauty was so perfectly described in an oration by Libanius that Emperor Julian, in a letter to Libanius, said that it would be useless for himself even to try writing about that place.²⁸ The adjective 'sacred' (ἱερόν) that the poet applies here to the sanctuary of Daphne at Antioch is also a hint that the more beautiful garden is located at Hieron across the Bosphorus from Constantinople.²⁹ Furthermore, in the contest between Hieron and Daphne, Hieron is victorious³⁰ because it contains an equally matched contest within a contest, as land and sea are tied in their contributions to the overall beauty of the garden.

Giovanni Viansino notes that the opening words of Agathias' poem, 'Yield to me' (εἰξον ἐμοί), derive from religious hymns in which the command is frequently meant to signal the point at which the profane are to depart from the ceremony that is about to begin.³¹ Agathias' epigram is not a hymn, but the religious language solemnizes the superficial beauty of the garden and suggests that the mingling of land and sea harbours a divine power that makes this site superior to the sanctuary of Daphne at Antioch, which by contrast is situated far from the sea (ἔκτοθι πόντου, v. 1) and whose beauty is one of merely rustic solitude. By contrast, the garden at Hieron speaking here boasts woodland nymphs as well as those in the sea: this is hardly a place of solitude, since it is here that the nymphs 'have placed their shared assembly' (ξυνήν θέντο συνηλυσίην, v. 4).

Agathias' use of the adjective 'shared' (ξυνήν) echoes Paul's use of the same word at AP 9.664.4. Sharing the adjective 'shared' seems a playful indication of the simultaneously competitive and collaborative nature of epigrammatic variation: just as the garden by the sea competes with the sacred hillside of Daphne, and just as the tree nymphs and the Nereids, in their competition,

²⁸ Lib. Or. 11.235–51 Förster and Jul. Ep. 98.32–8 Bidez. On the identification of the 'sacred hillside of Daphne' as the sanctuary of Daphne at Antioch, see Viansino (1967), 80; Waltz and Soury (1974), 261.

²⁹ Waltz and Soury (1974), 261 incorrectly suppose that the two sites being compared in the epigram are the Daphne of Antioch and the Daphne of Constantinople.

³⁰ Galli Calderini (1992), 117–18 notes the panegyric nature of the ecphrasis.

³¹ Viansino (1967), 80, with citations.

contribute *terpsis* to the garden, so too the poet-colleagues of the *Cycle* engage in a friendly contest that culminates in an anthology of unmatched charm.

In the final couplet, Agathias picks up the theme of contest from Paul's preceding poem, as the garden explains that the nymphs 'contended over me' (v. 5). But whereas in Paul's poem Charis acted as judge, Agathias gives that role to Poseidon, called here by his Homeric epithet *Κυανοχαίτης* ('Dark-Haired'). Agathias' choice of Poseidon and his use of this particular epithet can be explained. Traditionally the word is taken to connote the dark blue of the sea,³² but, of its eleven instances in the Homeric poems, five are coupled with the adjective 'earth-moving' (*γαιήοχος*) or 'earth shaker' (*ἐνοσίχθων*).³³ Nonnus uses the epithet *Κυανοχαίτης* twenty times, and once even in conjunction with the phrase 'shaker of the earth' (*χθονὸς...τινάκτορα*, *D.* 21.155); in fact, throughout the *Dionysiaca*, Poseidon is called far more often by his terrestrial epithets *Ἐνοσίχθων* and *Ἐννοσίγαιος* ('Earth Shaker'). In the epic tradition, therefore, Poseidon is a god who exerts his power equally over land and sea, and so in Agathias' epigram he is ideally suited to judge the contest between sea nymphs and wood nymphs.

A further modification on Paul's epigram comes in the final verse of Agathias' poem. Whereas in Paul's poem Charis is unable to make a judgement in favour of any single faction of nymphs, in Agathias' poem the garden declares that Poseidon has ruled 'and placed [it] as a middle boundary for both sides'. Agathias thus transforms the judicial *aporia* of Charis into Poseidon's decisive judgement, so that the garden is both the site of conflict and the very compromise, the space between that transforms *eris* into aesthetic beauty and delight.

Agathias' poem is followed in the *Greek Anthology* by an anonymous couplet on a garden called Eros (*AP* 9.666), but the next poem in the sequence by Arabius Scholasticus, though apparently for a different site from the garden at Hieron, nevertheless is worth considering alongside the epigrams by Paul and Agathias because this *προάστειον* ('suburb'), which is full of gardens, charms precisely owing to its mingling of land and sea:

ὔδασι καὶ κήποισι καὶ ἄλσεσι καὶ Διονύσῳ
καὶ πόντου πλήθῳ γείτονος εὐφροσύνη.
τερπνὰ δέ μοι γαίης τε καὶ ἐξ ἁλὸς ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος
καὶ γριπεὺς ὀρέγει δῶρα καὶ ἀγρονόμος.
τοὺς δ' ἐν ἔμοι μίμνοντας ἢ ὀρνίθων τις αἰεῖδων
ἦ γλυκὴ πορθμύων φθέγμα παρηγορέει.
(Arab. *AP* 9.667)

5

In waters and gardens and groves and Dionysus
and in the neighbouring sea's merriment I abound.

³² Cf. *LSJ*.

³³ *Γαίηοχος*: *Homeric Hymns* 22.6; *Il.* 15.174, 15.201; *Od.* 9.528; *ἐνοσίχθων*: *Od.* 3.6.

And both the fisherman and the farmer proffer gifts
 delightful to me, from the sea and the earth respectively.
 And those passing time in me either one of the birds singing
 or the sweet voice of the ferrymen consoles.

As in Agathias' poem, the place itself announces its own loveliness,³⁴ but for Arabius it is not a site of contention or dispute. Gone from Arabius' poem are the factions of competing nymphs, though the neighbourhood remains a place of abundance, illustrated by the catalogue of four nouns with which the poem begins. The name Dionysus is, of course, a commonplace for wine or the vine in late antique poetry,³⁵ but, given the strongly pagan flavour of the poems by Paul and Agathias, Arabius' inclusion of Dionysus here is also an explicit reminder of the pagan divinity imagined to be residing in the precinct.

In the second couplet the place explains that a fisherman and a farmer present it with gifts from the sea and the earth. These verses confirm an interpretation of the epigram as an expression of pagan thought, evoking the devotional epigrams from the first book of the *Cycle*, which indeed contain a number of fictional devotions to pagan gods from both farmers and fishermen.³⁶ The statement that the offerings from the land and the sea are 'delightful' (τερπνά, v. 3) connects this epigram with what Paul called the ξυνῇ τέρψις (AP 9.664.4), that 'delight' created through the combination of the garden's marine and terrestrial aspects. In Arabius' conception, though, the precinct's *terpsis* is not merely an abstract effect from which an observer may derive aesthetic enjoyment, but a substantial medium through which humans may express gratitude to the divine. In the hands of Paul and Agathias, the landscape is a work of art to be described or read for mythological interpretation. However, like the clever artisan who blended land and sea in the creation of the garden at Hieron, Arabius blends the ecphrastic and devotional subgenres to create a hybrid form.

The final couplet returns to the anonymous visitors of the precinct, 'those passing time in me', such as the ones who served as the speakers in Paul's epigrams, though they are now the ones observed. Either a singing bird or the ferrymen's sweet voice comforts them (vv. 5–6); the beauty of the place is not just visual but aural. The turn towards singing, and especially the participle ἀείδων, the quintessential verb of epic singing, connects these verses with the theme of poetry, in which case 'those passing time' in the neighbourhood become assimilated to the readers of Greek epigram, who equally enjoy the intermingling of land and sea and its combined beauty, which appeals to both eye and ear.

³⁴ On Arabius, see Cameron and Cameron (1966b), 10–11; Schulte (2006), 14.

³⁵ See Schulte (2006), 15, with citations.

³⁶ AP 6.25–30, 6.40–1, 6.55, 6.72, and 6.79. Especially relevant is Agath. AP 6.167, the dedication of a goat to Pan made by a certain Cleonicus, who was both a fisherman and a hunter.

6. THE GARDEN OF HERACLIUS' PATRIARCH

From the aesthetic ambiguities of the *Cycle* poets, we move in the following century to the garden as a stage for the blazing clarity of Christian faith. The imperial garden of Heraclius in Constantinople was illuminated by the combined power of church and state; and, while the emperor himself was absent from the imperial capital and tending to the military crisis in the East, Patriarch Sergius served as his spiritual surrogate.³⁷ Unlike Nero's spectacular theatre of death or Justinian's wilful imposition of beauty upon the landscape, the garden of Heraclius' patriarch fuses religious and imperial authority to project an unambiguously focused expression of Roman ideology:

κῆπος ἔην ὅδε χώρος· ἀπὸ σκιερῶν δὲ πετήλων
 νυκτοφανῆς τελέθων ἔσκεπεν ἡέλιον.
 νῦν δὲ παναιγλήεντα καὶ εὐδιον εἶρε τελέσσαι
 Σέργιος αὐτόπτης μυστιπόλος Τριάδος,
 ἔνθα λίθος στατὸς οὗτος ἀειδίνητον ἀνάγκην
 ἐπτάκις ἀγγέλλει ἄντυγος οὐρανίης.

5

(anon. AP 9.806)

This place was a garden, and because of its shady foliage
 it used to keep out the sun, thus taking on the appearance of night.
 But now Sergius, eyewitness performer of the mystic rite of the Trinity,
 found out how to make it all-shining and clear,
 where this standing stone seven times announces
 the ever-revolving force of the heavenly vault.

These verses by an anonymous poet (possibly Sergius himself, or even George of Pisidia)³⁸ commemorate the patriarch's renovation of an overgrown garden and the erection in its place of a stone clock, upon which the epigram appears to have been inscribed.³⁹ The exact location of this garden is unknown. Playing upon the contrast between light and dark, however, the poem expands the frame of reference beyond the immediate setting of the garden in order to encompass the cosmic significance of the Christian faith, here embodied by Sergius and his religious authority. The adjective *νυκτοφανῆς* ('having the appearance of night', v. 2), which describes the formerly overgrown garden, in pagan culture was an epithet for Hecate used in magical incantations.⁴⁰ In an allegorical reading of the space, the garden that 'used to keep out the sun'

³⁷ On the close relationship between Heraclius and Patriarch Sergius, and on Sergius' role in the events of 626 CE, see Kaegi (2003), 60; Howard-Johnston (2010), 36–59.

³⁸ On the affinity of the epigram with the poetry of George of Pisidia, see Angiò (2006), 129–30.

³⁹ A second epigram on Sergius' clock, namely AP 9.807, makes no reference to the garden setting; see Angiò (2006), 127–9.

⁴⁰ Heitsch (1961–4), 1: 10.20–3, 12.1–2; Preisendanz and Henrichs (1973–4), 4.2520, 4.2817; SEG 26.819.

(ἔσκεπεν ἡέλιον, v. 2) refers to the (supposed) darkness of pre-Christian culture. Now, however, the place is 'all-shining and clear' (παναιγλήεντα καὶ εὐδιον, v. 3), and the man responsible is the patriarch himself, whose characterization as αὐτόπτης ('eyewitness', v. 4) announces him as an agent of vision and light. As μυστιπóλος Τριάδος ('performer of the mystic rite of the Trinity', v. 4), too, Sergius leads a community of μύσται ('initiates'), a word that comes from μύειν, 'to close the eyes' in the presence of sacred ritual;⁴¹ the epithet evokes a pious averting of eyes and in this way reinforces the thematic contrast in the epigram between light and dark.

Sergius' self-fashioning as a bringer of light to a place poetically linked with the pagan goddess Hecate is motivated. The sixth-century historian Hesychius of Miletus records that in the distant past the people of Byzantium erected 'a torch-bearing statue of Hecate' (λαμπαδηφόρον Ἑκάτης...ἄγαλμα) to commemorate their victory over Philip II of Macedon in 340/39 BCE: on the moonless night of the attack, the goddess stirred the dogs to barking and brought clouds of fire to the northern regions of the city.⁴² The sixth-century lexicographer Stephanus of Byzantium records an alternative account, in which Hecate Phosphoros ('Light-Bearer': ἡ Ἑκάτη φωσφόρος) made torches appear to the citizens in the night, thus alerting them to the attack of Philip's army by means of tunnels dug beneath the city walls; from then on, the inhabitants called the place Phosphorion.⁴³

These stories certainly haunted the Byzantine imagination in the wake of the siege of Constantinople carried out by Persian and Avar forces in the summer of 626 CE.⁴⁴ Emperor Heraclius himself was on campaign against Persian forces in the East, although, as mentioned above, his absence from Constantinople was alleviated in part by the ecclesiastical guidance of Patriarch Sergius.⁴⁵ His contemporary Theodore Syncellus reports that, in order to enlist divine aid, Sergius displayed at the western gates of the city icons of the Theotokos, which were 'like a sun most unerring, expelling the darkness with its beams' (οἷα ἥλιον ἀπλανέστατον ταῖς ἀκτῖσι τὸ σκότος διώκοντα).⁴⁶ At the critical point of the siege, the khan of the Avars is said to have announced: 'I see a woman in solemn garb running along the wall by herself.'⁴⁷ Like Hecate in an earlier age, the Theotokos was responsible for the failure of the siege and brought a new saving light to the imperial city, and Sergius could proudly claim to be her αὐτόπτης μυστιπóλος.

⁴¹ See LSJ s.v. μύστης. ⁴² Hsch.Mil. *Patria* 1.25 Berger.

⁴³ St.Byz. *Ethnika* B 130 s.v. Βόσπορος Billerbeck.

⁴⁴ For details of the siege, see Kaegi (2003), 133–40.

⁴⁵ On Heraclius' absence, see Theodore Syncellus, *Analecta avarica* 303.33–5 Sternbach, and George of Pisidia, *Bellum avaricum* 246–93 Pertusi. See also Kaegi (2003), 135.

⁴⁶ Theodore Syncellus, *Analecta avarica* 304.6–7 Sternbach.

⁴⁷ *Chronicon Paschale* 725 Dindorf.

This epigram, which celebrates Sergius' sun-drenched horticultural style, also prompts reflection on the transformed significance of the garden in late Roman culture: what was formerly a *locus amoenus*, a sensual retreat from urban life, has been reconceived as a *locus luminosus*, an open space for contemplating divine illumination and the nature of time and of the *kosmos*. The entire cycle of the day belongs to God, according to Sergius' own liturgical innovation of 624 CE, which concluded Communion with a new prayer: 'Protect us in your holiness as we think about your justice all day long [*ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν*]. Alleluia!'⁴⁸ Sergius' garden further illustrates that God's time was not circumscribed by the mass or by the walls of Hagia Sophia. The epigram in question makes the spiritual connection between horticulture and Christian horology: the cleared plaza or courtyard of the garden is itself symbolic of the expanse 'of the heavenly vault' (*ἄντυγος οὐρανίης*, v. 6), while the inscribed stone clock stands as an insistent reminder of the 'ever-revolving force' (*ἀειδίνητον ἀνάγκην*, v. 5) to which even the patriarch and emperor are subject. That the stone announces this universal force 'seven times' (*ἐπτάκις*) probably alludes to the seven markings dividing the face of the clock into six hourly sections.⁴⁹ But the adverb also evokes the seven days of creation, and Christian visitors to the patriarch's garden would remember God's primordial garden in Eden.

7. CONCLUSION

Lucillius' skoptic epigram lampoons the artistic pretensions of an emperor who transformed his palatial gardens into a space for the myth-inspired *crematio* of the unfortunate Meniscus. Whether or not Meniscus himself was a Christian, his death recalls similar *cremationes* of Christians in Nero's gardens. In their later ecphrastic epigrams on Justinian's garden, the poets of Agathias' *Cycle* celebrate the imperial achievement in landscape design. But ecphrastic epigram, as subjective interpretation, contains also an implicit critique of the emperor's own artistic vision. While the official inscription from the site announces Justinian's imposition of beauty over land and sea, the *Cycle* poets read the garden as a place of aesthetic ambiguity, alive with pagan deities. Despite Justinian's orthodoxy, his poets in all their ecphrases keep Christianity out of the imperial garden, in the same way in which Sergius' overgrown garden 'used to keep out the sun' (*AP* 9.806.2). In the following century, however, the patriarch clears the imperial garden of its pagan associations and installs a blazing Christian vision of the universe. In the age of

⁴⁸ *Chronicon Paschale* 714.17–20 Dindorf; see also Kaegi (2003), 124–5.

⁴⁹ Waltz and Soury (1974), 274.

Nero, the condemned Christian body was a grim source of illumination for night-time revels in the gardens of the Domus Aurea, but by the time of Heraclius' reign in the seventh century CE the light of Christian ideology permeates every corner of the imperial garden. It must be said that the inscribed epigram authorized by Sergius represents only one interpretation of the patriarch's garden, and it remains unknown whether other literary epigrams by poets of the Heraclian age circulated and offered alternative interpretations of the same space. Nevertheless, even in the absence of other such epigrams, the selfsame inscription commemorating the patriarch's renovation of the garden forever summons the ghosts of the classical past. Every reading of the epigram, whether upon the inscribed surface of Sergius' clock or within the pages of an anthology, reactivates and repurposes the memory of Hecate *νυκτοφανής*, the pre-Christian saviour of Byzantium. From the early principate until the end of antiquity, epigrams on imperial gardens gave voice to competing visions of the artistic manipulation of nature at the highest level of Roman culture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the editors of this volume, Maria Kanellou in particular for her insightful comments on earlier versions of this essay.

Bibliography

- Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002), *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 35), Berkeley, CA.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. and Barbantani, S. (2007), 'Inscribing Lyric', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 429–58.
- Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M. (eds) (2004), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309) (Hellenic Studies 2), Washington, DC.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S. A. (2012), *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets*, Cambridge.
- Agosti, G. (2001), 'Late Antique Iambics and *iambikè idéa*', in Cavarzere, A., Aloni, A., and Barchiesi, A. (eds), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches), Lanham, MD, 219–55.
- Agosti, G. (2005), 'L'etopea nella poesia greca tardoantica', in Amato, E. and Schamp, J. (eds), *ἩΘΟΙΟΙΑ: La Représentation de caractères entre fiction scolaire et réalité vivante à l'époque impériale et tardive* (Cardo 3), Salerno, 34–60.
- Agosti, G. (2008), 'Epigrammi lunghi nella produzione epigrafica tardoantica', in Morelli, A. M. (ed.), *Epigramma longum: Da Marziale alla tarda antichità/From Martial to Late Antiquity: Atti del convegno internazionale*, Cassino, 29–31 maggio 2006, 2 vols (Collana Scientifica 21), Cassino, 663–92.
- Agosti, G. (ed.) (2013 [2004]), *Nonno di Panopoli: Le Dionisiache*, vol. 3: *Canti XXV–XXXIX* (BUR Classici Greci e Latini), Milan.
- Allen, F. D. (1885–6), 'On Greek Versification in Inscriptions', in *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, vol. 4, Boston, MA, 35–204.
- Aloni, A. and Iannucci, A. (2007), *L'elegia greca e l'epigramma dalle origini al V secolo: Con un'appendice sulla 'nuova' elegia di Archiloco* (Le Monnier Università, Lingue e letterature), Florence.
- Aly, W. (ed.) (1914), *Mitteilungen aus der Freiburger Papyrussammlung*, vol. 1: *Literarische Stücke* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse Abh. 2), Heidelberg.
- Amato, E. and Ventrella, G. (2005), 'L'Éthopée dans la pratique scolaire et littéraire: Répertoire complet', in Amato, E. and Schamp, J. (eds), *ἩΘΟΙΟΙΑ: La Représentation de caractères entre fiction scolaire et réalité vivante à l'époque impériale et tardive* (Cardo 3), Salerno, 213–31.
- Ambühl, A. (2002), 'Zwischen Tragödie und Roman: Kallimachos' Epigramm auf den Selbstmord der Basilo (20 Pf. = 32 Gow-Page = AP 7.517)', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Hellenistica Groningana 6), Leuven, 1–26.
- Ambühl, A. (2004), 'Entertaining Theseus and Heracles: The *Hecale* and the *Victoria Berenices* as a Diptych', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Callimachus II* (Hellenistica Groningana 7), Leuven, 23–48.

- Amedick, R. (2005), 'Dornauszieher: Bukolische und dionysische Gestalten zwischen Antike und Mittelalter', *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 32, 17–51.
- Anagnostou-Laoutides, E. (2015), 'An Instance of Pathological Love in the Greek Anthology and Elizabethan Poetry', *GRBS* 55, 558–82.
- Aneziri, S. (2003), *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte, Organisation und Wirkung der hellenistischen Technitenvereine* (Historia Einzelschriften 163), Stuttgart.
- Angelova, D. N. (2015), *Sacred Founders: Women, Men, and Gods in the Discourse of Imperial Founding, Rome through Early Byzantium*, Oakland.
- Angiò, F. (2006), 'La meridiana del patriarca Sergio (Ant. Pal. IX 806 e 807)', *Νέα Πώμη: Rivista di ricerche bizantinistiche* 3, 123–30.
- Angiò, F. (2010), 'Posidippo di Pella (?): Epigr. *XXXI Fernández-Galiano', *PP* 65, 199–207.
- Argentieri, L. (1998), 'Epigramma e libro: Morfologia delle raccolte epigrammatiche premeleagree', *ZPE* 121, 1–20.
- Argentieri, L. (ed.) (2003), *Gli epigrammi degli Antipatri* (Rane Studi 35), Bari.
- Argentieri, L. (2007), 'Meleager and Philip as Epigram Collectors', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 147–64.
- Arnott, W. G. (ed.) (1996), *Alexis: The Fragments* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 31), Cambridge.
- Arrighetti, G. (1960), *Epicuro: Opere* (Classici della filosofia 4), Turin. Repr. 1973.
- Asper, M. (1997), *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos* (Hermes: Einzelschriften 75), Stuttgart.
- Ast, R. (2014), Review of Wilkinson, K. W. (2012), *The New Epigrams of Palladas: A Fragmentary Papyrus Codex (P. CtYBR inv. 4000)*, *BMCRev* 2014.02.23.
- Auberton, R. (1969), 'La Translittération d'Homère', *Byzantion* 39, 13–34.
- Auberton, R. (ed.) (1972), *Anthologie grecque*, Part 1: *Anthologie Palatine*, vol. 10: *Livre XI*, Paris. Repr. 2002.
- Auberton, R. and Buffière, F. (1980), *Anthologie grecque*, Part 2: *Anthologie de Planude*, vol. 13, Paris.
- Austin, C. and Bastianini, G. (eds) (2002), *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia* (Biblioteca classica 3), Milan.
- Austin, J. L. (1962), *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, ed. by J. O. Urmson, Oxford.
- Baale, M. J. (1903), *Studia in Anytes poetriae vitam et carminum reliquias*, Diss., Haarlem.
- Bailey, C. (ed.) (1947), *Titi Lucreti Cari: De rerum natura: Libri sex*, 3 vols, Oxford.
- Bakker, E. (2016), 'Archaic Epigram and the Seal of Theognis', in Sistakou, E. and Rengakos, A. (eds), *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 43), Berlin, 195–214.
- Baldwin, B. (1975), 'The Epigrams of Lucian', *Phoenix* 29, 311–35.
- Barbantani, S. (2001), *Φάτις νικηφόρος: Frammenti di elegia encomiastica nell'età delle Guerre Galatiche: Supplementum Hellenisticum 958 e 969* (Biblioteca di Aevum antiquum 15), Milan.
- Barbantani, S. (2005), 'Goddess of Love and Mistress of the Sea: Notes on a Hellenistic Hymn to Arsinoe-Aphrodite (P. Lit. Goodsp. 2, I–IV)', *AncSoc* 35, 135–65.

- Barbantani, S. (2010), 'Idéologie royale et littérature de cour dans l'Égypte lagide', in Savalli-Lestrade, I. and Cogitore, I. (eds), *Des rois au prince: Pratiques du pouvoir monarchique dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain (IV^e siècle avant J.-C.–II^e siècle après J.-C.)*, Grenoble, 227–51.
- Barbantani, S. (2012), 'Hellenistic Epinician', in Agócs, P., Carey, C., and Rawles, R. (eds), *Receiving the Komos: Ancient and Modern Receptions of the Victory Ode* (BICS Suppl. 112), London, 37–55.
- Barbantani, S. (2014), 'Déjà la pierre pense où votre nom s'inscrit: Identity in Context in Verse Epitaphs for Hellenistic Soldiers', in Hunter, R. L., Rengakos, A., and Sistakou, E. (eds), *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 25), Berlin, 301–34.
- Barbantani, S. (2015), Review of Parsons, P. J., Maehler, H., and Maltomini, F. (eds) (2015), *The Vienna Epigrams Papyrus* (G 40611), *Sehepunkte* 15.12. <https://www.recensio.net/rezensionen/zeitschriften/sehepunkte/15/12/the-vienna-epigrams-papyrus>.
- Barbantani, S. (2016), '"Simplify me when I am dead": War Heroes in Hellenistic Funerary Epigrams', *AevumAnt* 16, 183–239.
- Barbantani, S. (2018), 'Fui buon poeta e buon soldato: Kleos militare e paideia poetica negli epigrammi epigrafici ellenistici', *Eikasmos* 29, 283–312.
- Barbantani, S. (forthcoming), 'Models of Virtue, Models of Poetry: The Quest for Everlasting Fame in Hellenistic Epigrammatic Poetry', in Faber, R. and Ager, S. (eds), *Celebrity, Fame, and Infamy in the Hellenistic World*, Toronto.
- Barchiesi, A. (2003), 'Niente sangue per Cupido (Ov. rem. 25–26)', in Gazich, R. (ed.), *Fecunda licentia: Tradizione e innovazione in Ovidio elegiaco: Atti delle giornate di studio Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Brescia e Milano, 16–17 aprile 2002* (Letteratura greca e latina: Ricerche), Milan, 37–48.
- Barchiesi, A. (2011), 'Roman Callimachus', in Acosta-Hughes, B., Lehnus, L., and Stephens, S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, Leiden, 511–33.
- Bar-Kochva, B. (1974), 'Menas' Inscription and Curupedion', *SCI* 1, 14–23.
- Barsby, J. (ed.) (1999), *Terence: Eunuchus* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), Cambridge.
- Bastianini, G. and Gallazzi, C. (eds) (1993), *Posidippo: Epigrammi: Testo e traduzione*, Milan.
- Bastianini, G. and Gallazzi, C., in collaboration with Austin, C. (eds) (2001), *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi* (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309), 2 vols (Papiri dell'Università degli Studi di Milano 8), Milan.
- Baumbach, M. (2015), 'Oionoskopika (21–35)', in Seidensticker, B., Stähli, A., and Wessels, A. (eds), *Der neue Poseidipp: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Texte zur Forschung 108), Darmstadt, 113–54.
- Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds) (2010), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge.
- Baumgarten, R. (2009), 'Dangerous Tears? Platonic Provocations and Aristotelic Answers', in Fögen, T. (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World*, Berlin, 85–104.
- Beard, M. (2012), 'The Cult of the "Great Mother" in Imperial Rome: The Roman and the Foreign', in Brandt, J. R. and Iddeng, J. W. (eds), *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice*, Oxford, 323–62.
- Beard, M., North, J., and Price, S. (1998), *The Religions of Rome*, 2 vols, Cambridge.

- Beckby, H. (ed.) (1957–8), *Anthologia graeca*, 4 vols (Tusculum-Bücherei), Munich. Repr. 1965 (vols 1–2) and 1968 (vols 3–4).
- Bell, P. N. (trans.) (2009), *Three Political Voices from the Age of Justinian: Agapetus, Advice to the Emperor, Dialogue on Political Science; Paul the Silentary, Description of Hagia Sophia* (Translated Texts for Historians 52), Liverpool.
- Benedetto, G. A. (2004), 'Su alcuni epigrammi di Antipatro di Sidone in relazione al nuovo Posidippo', *Eikasmos* 15, 189–225.
- Benediktson, D. T. (2000), *Literature and the Visual Arts in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Norman.
- Benelli, L. (2015), 'Osservazioni sul P. Ct. YBR Inv. 4000 e sulla sua attribuzione a Pallada di Alessandria', *ZPE* 193, 53–63.
- Benelli, L. (2016), 'The Age of Palladas', *Mnemosyne* 69, 978–1007.
- Bentley, R. (1761), 'Callimachi fragmenta a Richardo Bentleio collecta', in Ernesti, J. A. (ed.), *Callimachi hymni, epigrammata et fragmenta*, vol. 1, Leiden, 413–580. Original publication in Graevius, T. (ed.) (1697), *Callimachi hymni, epigrammata et fragmenta*, vol. 1, Utrecht, 303–429, 434–8.
- Bergamin, M. (ed.) (2005), *Aenigmata Symposii: La fondazione dell'enigmistica come genere poetico* (Per verba: Testi mediolatini con traduzione 22), Florence.
- Bernard, É. (1969), *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine: Recherches sur la poésie épigrammatique des Grecs en Égypte* (Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 98), Paris.
- Bernard, F. and Demoen, K. (eds) (2012), *Poetry and Its Contexts in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, Farnham.
- Bernard, F. and Demoen, K. (forthcoming), 'Book Epigrams', in Rhoby, A., Zagklas, N., and Hörandner, W. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Byzantine Poetry*, Leiden.
- Bernard, F. and Livanos, C. (eds, trans.) (2018), *The Poems of Christopher of Mytilene and John Mauropous* (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library), Cambridge, MA.
- Beta, S. (2014a), 'An Enigmatic Literature: Interpreting an Unedited Collection of Byzantine Riddles in a Manuscript of Cardinal Bessarion (Marcianus Graecus 512)', *DOP* 68, 211–40.
- Beta, S. (2014b), '"You possess me, you bring me with you, I am a part of you": A New Byzantine Riddle in the Pal. Gr. 116', *ByzZ* 107, 37–50.
- Beta, S. (2016), *Il labirinto della parola: Enigmi, oracoli e sogni nella cultura antica* (Einaudi Saggi 956), Turin.
- Bettenworth, A. (2002), 'Asclepiades XXV G.–P. (A.P. 5,181): Ein Beitrag zum sympotisch-erotischen Epigramm', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Hellenistica Groningana 6), Leuven, 27–38.
- Bettenworth, A. (2007), 'The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 69–93.
- Bettenworth, A. (2012), 'Phaeacians at the Birthday Party: A.P. 11.44 (Philodemus) and Its Epic Background', *Aitia* 2. <https://journals.openedition.org/aitia/380>.
- Bettini, M. (1992), *Il ritratto dell'amante* (Einaudi Saggi 761), Turin.
- Bevan, E. R. (trans.) (1931), *The Poems of Leonidas of Tarentum*, Oxford.
- Bianconi, D. (2009), 'Et le livre s'est fait poésie', in Odorico, P., Hinterberger, M., and Agapitos, P. (eds), *Doux remède...: Poésie et poétique à Byzance: Actes du IV^e colloque international philologique, Paris, 23–24–25 février 2006*, Paris, 15–35.

- Bieber, M. (1961 [1955]), *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*, New York.
- Bing, P. (1995), 'Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus', *A&A* 41, 115–31.
- Bing, P. (1998), 'Between Literature and the Monuments', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (Hellenistica Groningana 3), Groningen, 21–43.
- Bing, P. (2002), 'The Un-Read Muse? Inscribed Epigram and Its Readers in Antiquity', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Hellenistica Groningana 6), Leuven, 39–66.
- Bing, P. (2002–3), 'Posidippus and the Admiral: Kallikrates of Samos in the Milan Epigrams', *GRBS* 43, 243–66. Repr. in Bing, P. (2009), *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*, Ann Arbor, MI, 234–52.
- Bing, P. (2004), 'Posidippus: *Iamatika*', in Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M. (eds), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309) (Hellenic Studies 2), Washington, DC, 276–91. Repr. in Bing, P. (2009), *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*, Ann Arbor, MI, 217–33.
- Bing, P. (2005), 'The Politics and Poetics of Geography in the Milan Posidippus Section One: On Stones (AB 1–20)', in Gutzwiller, K. J. (ed.), *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, 119–40. Repr. in Bing, P. (2009), *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*, Ann Arbor, MI, 253–72.
- Bing, P. (2008 [1988]), *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic poets*, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Bing, P. (2009), *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Bing, P. (2014), 'Inscribed Epigrams in and out of Sequence', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Hellenistic Poetry in Context* (Hellenistica Groningana 20), Leuven, 1–24.
- Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds) (2007a), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden.
- Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (2007b), 'Introduction to the Study of Hellenistic Epigram', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 1–26.
- Bingen, J. (2002), 'Posidippe: Le Poète et les princes', in Bastianini, G. (ed.), *Un poeta ritrovato: Posidippo di Pella: Atti della giornata di studio, Milano, 23 novembre 2001*, Milan, 47–59.
- Birt, T. (1882), *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur: Mit Beiträgen zur Textgeschichte des Theokrit, Catull, Properz und anderer Autoren*, Berlin.
- Blanc, N. and Gury, F. (1986), 'Eros/Amor, Cupido', in *LIMC* III.1, 952–1049.
- Blomqvist, J. (1998), 'The Development of the Satirical Epigram in the Hellenistic Period', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (Hellenistica Groningana 3), Groningen, 45–60.
- Bonsignore, C. (2013), 'Μητρός ἀγύρτης: Sguardo greco e realtà orientale in un epigramma di Alceo di Messene (A.P. 6.218 = 21 G-P)', *Appunti Romani di Filologia* 15, 67–90.
- Borg, B. E. (2010), 'Epigrams in Archaic Art: The "Chest of Kypselos"', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 81–99.

- Bormann, D. and Wittchow, F. (eds) (2008), *Emotionalität in der Antike: Zwischen Performativität und Diskursivität: Festschrift für Johannes Christes dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen* (Körper, Zeichen, Kultur 23), Berlin.
- Borthwick, E. K. (1970), 'The Riddle of the Tortoise and the Lyre', *Music and Letters* 51, 373–87.
- Bowie, E. L. (2007), 'From Archaic Elegy to Hellenistic Sympotic Epigram?', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 95–112.
- Bowie, E. L. (2008), 'Luxury Cruisers? Philip's Epigrammatists between Greece and Rome', *AevumAnt* 8, 223–58.
- Bowie, E. L. (2010), 'Epigram as Narration: Appendix: Lengths of Verse Inscriptions 750–400 bc', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 313–84.
- Bowra, C. M. (1959), 'Palladas and Christianity', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* 45, 91–5. Repr. in Bowra, C. M. (1970), *On Greek Margins*, Oxford, 253–66.
- Bowra, C. M. (1960a), 'Palladas and the Converted Olympians', *ByzZ* 53, 1–7. Repr. in Bowra, C. M. (1970), *On Greek Margins*, Oxford, 245–52.
- Bowra, C. M. (1960b), 'Palladas on Tyche', *CQ* 10, 118–28.
- Boyaval, B. (2001), 'Dix notes égyptiennes', *Kentron* 17.1, 53–81.
- Bravi, L. (2006), *Gli epigrammi di Simonide e le vie della tradizione* (Filologia e critica 94), Rome.
- Bravo, B. (1997), *Pannychis e simposio: Feste private notturne di donne e uomini nei testi letterari e nel culto* (Filologia e critica 79), Pisa.
- Brecht, F. J. (1930), *Motiv- und Typengeschichte des griechischen Spottepigramms* (Philologus Supplbd. 22.2), Leipzig.
- Breitenberger, B. (2007), *Aphrodite and Eros: The Development of Erotic Mythology in Early Greek Poetry and Cult* (Routledge Studies in Classics), New York.
- Bremmer, J. N. (1983), *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, Princeton, NJ.
- Brunck, R. F. P. (1785 [1772–6]), *Analecta veterum poetarum graecorum*, 3 vols, Strasbourg.
- Bruss, J. S. (2005), *Hidden Presences: Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram* (Hellenistica Groningana 10), Leuven.
- Bruss, J. S. (2010a), 'Ecphrasis in Fits and Starts? Down to 300 bc', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 385–403.
- Bruss, J. S. (2010b), 'Epigram', in Clauss, J. J. and Cuypers, M. (eds), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Oxford, 117–35.
- Buffière, F. (ed.) (1970), *Anthologie grecque*, Part 1: *Anthologie Palatine*, vol. 12: *Livres XIII–XV*, Paris.
- Bundy, E. L. (1962), *Studia Pindarica*, 2 vols (University of California Publications in Classical Philology 18), Berkeley, CA.
- Bundy, E. L. (1972), 'The "Quarrel Between Kallimachos and Apollonios", Part I: The Epilogue of Kallimachos's *Hymn to Apollo*', *CSCA* 5, 39–94.
- Burkert, W. (1977), *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Die Religionen der Menschheit 15), Stuttgart.

- Burkert, W. (1985 [1977]), *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. by J. Raffan, Oxford.
- Cagnat, R. (1889), 'Sur les manuels professionnels des graveurs d'inscriptions romaines', *RPh* 13, 51–65.
- Cairns, D. (2013), 'The Imagery of *Erōs* in Plato's *Phaedrus*', in Sanders, E., Thumiger, C., Carey, C., and Lowe, N. (eds), *Erōs in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 229–50.
- Cairns, F. (1972), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh.
- Cairns, F. (2008), 'The Hellenistic *epigramma longum*', in Morelli, A. A. (ed.), *Epigramma longum: Da Marziale alla tarda antichità/From Martial to Late Antiquity: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 29–31 maggio 2006*, 2 vols (Collana Scientifica 21), Cassino, 55–80.
- Cairns, F. (2016), *Hellenistic Epigram: Contexts of Exploration*, Cambridge.
- Cairon, É. (2009), *Les Épitaphes métriques hellénistiques du Péloponnèse à la Thessalie* (Hungarian Polis Studies 18), Budapest.
- Cameron, A. (1964), 'Palladas and the Nikai', *JHS* 84, 54–62.
- Cameron, A. (1965a), 'Palladas and Christian Polemic', *JRS* 55, 17–30.
- Cameron, A. (1965b), 'Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt', *Historia* 14, 470–509.
- Cameron, A. (1968), 'The Garlands of Meleager and Philip', *GRBS* 9, 323–49.
- Cameron, A. (1970a), *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*, Oxford.
- Cameron, A. (1970b), 'Michael Psellus and the Date of the Palatine Anthology', *GRBS* 11, 339–50.
- Cameron, A. (1977), 'Some Prefects Called Julian', *Byzantion* 47, 42–64.
- Cameron, A. (1980), 'The Garland of Philip', *GRBS* 21, 43–62.
- Cameron, A. (1993), *The Greek Anthology: From Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford.
- Cameron, A. (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton, NJ.
- Cameron, A. (2016), 'Palladas: New Poems, New Date?', in Cameron, A., *Wandering Poets and Other Essays on Late Greek Literature and Philosophy*, Oxford, 91–112.
- Cameron, A. and Parsons, P. J. (2012), 'Anthology', in Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A., and Eidinow, E. (eds), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford, 98–9.
- Cameron, A. M. (ed.) (1970), *Agathias*, Oxford.
- Cameron, A. M. and Cameron, A. (1966a), 'Anth. Plan. 72: A Propaganda Poem from the Reign of Justin II', *BICS* 13, 101–4.
- Cameron, A. M. and Cameron, A. (1966b), 'The Cycle of Agathias', *JHS* 86, 6–25.
- Campbell, C. S. (2017), 'Sound, Sense, and Sequence in Meleager and Catullus', *SyllClass* 28, 51–79.
- Campetella, M. C. (1997–8), 'Le concezioni sulla morte in mare e sui naufragi negli epigrammi dell'*Anthologia greca*: Alcune considerazioni antropologiche', *AFLM* 30–1, 293–308.
- Cantarella, R. (ed.) (1992 [1948]), *Poeti bizantini*, ed. by F. Conca, 2 vols (BUR Classici Greci e Latini), Milan.
- Caponigro, M. S. (1984), 'Five Men and Ten Ships: A Riddle in Athenaeus', *GRBS* 25, 285–96.
- Carey, C. (2016), 'Mapping *Iambos*: Mining the Minor Talents', in Swift, L. and Carey, C. (eds), *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*, Oxford, 122–39.

- Carrington, A. G. (1957), 'A Greek Enigma', *Mnemosyne* 10, 340.
- Carrington, A. G. (1958), 'Note on Greek Anthology XIV 24', *Mnemosyne* 11, 339–40.
- Carrington, A. G. (1961), 'Ram, Tortoise and Lyre in Greek Epigram', *Mnemosyne* 14, 22.
- Cates, D. F. (2003), Review of Nussbaum, M. C. (2001), *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*, *Journal of Religious Ethics* 31.2, 325–41.
- Cerri, G. (1983), 'La madre degli dei nell'Elena di Euripide: Tragedia e rituale', *QS* 18, 155–95.
- Chaniotis, A. (2009), 'Lament for a Young Man: A New Epigram from Aphrodisias', in Martínez Fernández, Á. (ed.), *Estudios de epigrafía griega* (Serie investigación 1), San Cristóbal de La Laguna, 469–78.
- Chaniotis, A. (2012a), 'Moving Stones: The Study of Emotions in Greek Inscriptions', in Chaniotis, A. (ed.), *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World* (HABES 52), Stuttgart, 91–129.
- Chaniotis, A. (ed.) (2012b), *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World* (HABES 52), Stuttgart.
- Chaniotis, A. and Ducrey, P. (eds) (2013), *Unveiling Emotions II: Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture* (HABES 55), Stuttgart.
- Christian, T. (2015), *Gebildete Steine: Zur Rezeption literarischer Techniken in den Verschriften seit dem Hellenismus* (Hypomnemata 197), Göttingen.
- Cichorius, C. (1922), *Römische Studien: Historisches, Epigraphisches, Literargeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms*, Leipzig.
- Cirio, A. M. (ed.) (2011), *Gli epigrammi di Giulia Balbilla (ricordi di una dama di corte) e altri testi al femminile sul Colosso di Memnone* (Satura 9), Lecce.
- Cistaro, M. (2009), *Sotto il velo di Pantea: Imagines e Pro imaginibus di Luciano* (Orione 3), Messina.
- Clack, J. (ed., trans.) (1992), *Meleager: The Poems*, Wauconda, IL.
- Clack, J. (ed., trans.) (1999), *Asclepiades of Samos and Leonidas of Tarentum: The Poems*, Wauconda, IL.
- Clack, J. (ed., trans.) (2001), *Dioscorides and Antipater of Sidon: The Poems*, Wauconda, IL.
- Clairmont, C. W. (1970), *Gravestone and Epigram: Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Period*, Mainz.
- Clarke, J. R. (1998–9), 'Look Who's Laughing: Humor in Tavern Painting as Index of Class and Acculturation', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 43–4, 27–48.
- Clarke, J. R. (2007), *Looking at Laughter: Humor, Power, and Transgression in Roman Visual Culture, 100 BC–AD 250*, Berkeley, CA.
- Clay, D. (2000), *Platonic Questions: Dialogues with the Silent Philosopher*, University Park, PA.
- Clayman, D. (2007), 'Philosophers and Philosophy in Greek Epigram', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 497–517.
- Coco, L. (ed.) (1988), *Callimaco: Epigrammi* (Manduria), Bari.
- Cogitore, I. (2010), 'Crinagoras et les poètes de la Couronne de Philippe: La Cour impériale romaine dans les yeux des Grecs', in Savalli-Lestrade, I. and Cogitore, I. (eds), *Des rois au prince: Pratiques du pouvoir monarchique dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain (IV^e siècle avant J.-C.–II^e siècle après J.-C.)*, Grenoble, 253–69.

- Coleman, K. M. (1990), 'Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments', *JRS* 80, 44–73.
- Condello, F. (2011), 'Osservazioni sul 'sigillo' di Teognide', *Incontri triestini di filologia classica* 9, 65–152.
- Connelly, J. B. (2007), *Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*, Princeton, NJ.
- Conte, G. B. (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, ed. by C. Segal (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 44), Ithaca, NY.
- Copley, F. O. (1956), *Exclusus amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry* (APA Philological Monographs 17), Madison WI.
- Corso, A., Mugellesi, R., and Rosati, G. (eds) (1988), *Gaio Plinio Secondo: Storia Naturale V: Mineralogia e storia dell'arte: Libri 33–37*, Turin.
- Cougny, E. (ed.) (1890), *Epigrammatum anthologia palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum*, 3 vols, Paris.
- Courtney, E. (1985), 'Three Poems of Catullus', *BICS* 32, 85–100.
- Cox, L. L. A. (1988), *A Critical Study of the Love Poetry of Meleager of Gadara*, Diss., Boston, MA.
- Cribiore, R. (1996), *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology 36), Atlanta, GA.
- Cribiore, R. (2001), *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton, NJ.
- Croisille, J.-M. (ed.) (1985), *Pline l'Ancien: Histoire naturelle: Livre XXXV* (Les Belles Lettres, Classiques en poche 11), Paris.
- Croke, B. (1980), 'Justinian's Bulgar Victory Celebration', *ByzSlav* 41, 188–95. Repr. in Croke, B. (1992), *Christian Chronicles and Byzantine History, 5th–6th Centuries*, Aldershot.
- Cuenca y Prado, L. A. de (ed.) (1974–6), *Calímaco: Epigramas* (Estudios Clásicos Suplementos 18–20), Madrid.
- Cuenca y Prado, L. A. de and Sánchez M. B. (eds) (1980), *Calímaco: Himnos, epigramas y fragmentos* (Biblioteca Clásica Gredos 33), Madrid.
- Cumont, F. V. M. (1949), *Lux perpetua*, Paris.
- Curtius, L. (1930), 'Poenitentia', in Arndt, P. et al. (eds), *Festschrift für James Loeb: Zum sechzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen archäologischen Freunden in Deutschland und Amerika*, Munich, 53–62.
- Daly, L. W. (1967), *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Collection Latomus 90), Brussels.
- Dasen, V. (1993), *Dwarfs in Ancient Egypt and Greece*, Oxford.
- Davidson, J. N. (1997), *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*, London.
- Davis, G. (1991), *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*, Berkeley, CA.
- Davis, G. (2012), *Parthenope: The Interplay of Ideas in Vergilian Bucolic* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 346), Leiden.
- Day, J. W. (1989), 'Rituals in Stone: Early Greek Grave Epigrams and Monuments', *JHS* 109, 16–28.
- Day, J. W. (1994), 'Interactive Offerings: Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual', *HSPH* 96, 37–74.

- Day, J. W. (2007), 'Poems on Stone: The Inscribed Antecedents of Hellenistic Epigram', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 29–47.
- Day, J. W. (2010), *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance*, Cambridge.
- Day, J. W. (2013), 'Epigraphic Literacy in Fifth-Century Epinician and Its Audiences', in Liddel, P. and Low, P. (eds), *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford, 217–30.
- Day, J. W. (2018), 'The "Spatial Dynamics" of Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram: Conversations among Locations, Monuments, Texts, and Viewer-Readers', in Petrovic, A., Petrovic, I., and Thomas, E. V. (eds), *The Materiality of Text: Placement, Perception, and Presence of Inscribed Texts in Classical Antiquity* (Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy 11), Leiden, 73–104.
- De Beer, S., Enenkel K. A. E., and Rijser, D. (eds) (2009), *The Neo-Latin Epigram: A Learned and Witty Genre* (Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia 25), Leuven.
- Decety, J. (2009), 'Empathy (Neuroscience Perspectives)', in Sander, D. and Scherer, K. R. (eds), *The Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences*, Oxford, 151–3.
- De Groote, M. (ed.) (2012), *Christophori Mitylenaii Versuum variorum collectio cryptensis* (Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 74), Turnhout.
- De Jong, I. J. F. (ed.) (2012), *Homer: Iliad Book XXII* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), Cambridge.
- Demangel, R. and Laumonier, A. (1923), 'Fouilles de Notion (1921) (Pl. X–XIII)', *BCH* 47, 353–86.
- Demoen, K. (1993), 'The Attitude towards Greek Poetry in the Verse of Gregory Nazianzen', in Den Boeft, J. and Hilhorst, A. (eds), *Early Christian Poetry: A Collection of Essays* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 22), Leiden, 235–52.
- Denniston, J. D. (1954 [1934]), *The Greek Particles*, Oxford.
- Derderian, K. (2001), *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 209), Leiden.
- De Stefani, C. and Magnelli, E. (2009), 'Lycophron in Byzantine Poetry (and Prose)', in Cusset, C. and Prioux, É. (eds), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité: Actes du colloque international de Lyon et Saint-Étienne, 18–20 janvier 2007* (Mémoires du Centre Jean Palerne 33), Saint-Étienne, 593–620.
- De Stefani, C. and Magnelli, E. (2011), 'Callimachus and Later Greek Poetry', in Acosta-Hughes, B., Lehnus, L., and Stephens, S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, Leiden, 534–65.
- Di Gregorio, L. (ed.) (1997), *Eronda: Mimiambi (I–IV)* (Biblioteca di Aevum Antiquum 9), Milan.
- Dijkstra, J. H. F. (2014), Review of Wilkinson, K. W. (2012), *The New Epigrams of Pallas: A Fragmentary Papyrus Codex (P. CtYBR inv. 4000)*, *Phoenix* 68, 370–3.
- Dilthey, K. (1891), *Symbolae criticae ad Anthologiam graecam ex libris manu scriptis petitae*, Göttingen.
- Di Marco, M. (ed.) (2013), *Studi su Asclepiade di Samo*, Rome.
- Di Marco, M., Palumbo Stracca, B. M., and Lelli, E. (eds) (2005), *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario: Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma 14–15 maggio 2004* (= *Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6), Pisa.

- Di Nino, M. M. (2008), 'Asclepius' Cult at the Court of the Ptolemies', *Hermes* 136, 167–87.
- Di Nino, M. M. (2010), *I fiori campestri di Posidippo: Ricerche sulla lingua e lo stile di Posidippo di Pella* (Hypomnemata 182), Göttingen.
- Dorandi, T. (ed.) (2013), *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 50), Cambridge.
- Dreliosi-Iraklidou, A. and Litinas, N. (2009–11), 'Ροδιακό όστρακο με ερωτικό επίγραμμα', *Eulimene* 10–12, 135–55.
- Drpić, I. (2016), *Epigram, Art and Devotion in Later Byzantium*, Cambridge.
- Dübner J. F. and Cougny, E. (eds) (1871–90), *Epigrammatum anthologia palatina: Cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum*, 3 vols, Paris.
- Düring, I. (1957), *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 5), Gothenburg.
- Dumitru, A. G. (2013), 'Les Séleucides et les Balkans (III–II siècles av. J.Chr.)', in Rufin Solas, A. (ed.), *Armées grecques et romaines dans le nord des Balkans: Conflits et intégration des communautés guerrières* (Akanthina 7), Gdańsk, 69–89.
- Durbec, Y. and Trajber, F. (eds) (2017), *Traditions épiques et poésie épigrammatique: Actes du colloque des 7, 8 et 9 novembre 2012 à Aix-en-Provence* (Hellenistica Groningana 22), Leuven.
- Dussaud, R. and Macler, F. (1901), *Voyage archéologique au Şafâ et dans le Djebel ed-Drûz*, Paris.
- Ecker, U. (1990), *Grabmal und Epigramm: Studien zur frühgriechischen Sepulkraldichtung* (Palingenesia 29), Stuttgart.
- Edmunds, L. (1982), 'The Latin Invitation-Poem: What Is It? Where Did It Come from?', *AJPh* 103, 184–8.
- Edmunds, L. (1997), 'The Seal of Theognis', in Edmunds, L. and Wallace, R. W. (eds), *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece* (with a preface by M. Bettini), Baltimore, MD, 29–48.
- Ehlers, J. (1867), *Αἰνιγμα et Γῆρυς*, Diss., Bonn.
- Ehlers, W.-W. (2008), 'Satirische Emotionen', in Bormann, D. and Wittchow, F. (eds), *Emotionalität in der Antike: Zwischen Performativität und Diskursivität: Festschrift für Johannes Christes dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen* (Körper, Zeichen, Kultur 23), Berlin, 157–67.
- El-Nassery, S. A. A., Wagner, G., and Hafeez Abdul-Al, A. (1978), 'Nouvelles stèles de Kôm Abou Bellou', *BIAO* 78, 231–58.
- Enenkel, K. A. E. and Pfeijffer, I. L. (eds) (2005), *The Manipulative Mode: Political Propaganda in Antiquity: A Collection of Case Studies* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 261), Leiden.
- Erler, M. (2010), 'Nēphōn logismos: A proposito del contesto letterario e filosofico di una categoria fondamentale del pensiero epicureo', *CErC* 40, 23–9.
- Fabbro, E. (2003), 'Il fatale approdo di cinque uomini su dieci navi: Un enigma in Athen. X 457 b–c', *Klio* 85, 399–410.
- Fain, G. L. (trans.) (2010), *Ancient Greek Epigrams: Major Poets in Verse Translation*, Berkeley, CA.
- Fantuzzi, M. (1980), 'La contaminazione dei generi letterari nella letteratura greca ellenistica: Rifiuto del sistema o evoluzione di un sistema?', *L&S* 15, 433–50.

- Fantuzzi, M. (2004), 'The Epigram', in Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R., *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge, 283–349.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2005), 'Posidippus at Court: The Contribution of the Ἰππικά of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 to the Ideology of Ptolemaic Kingship', in Gutzwiller, K. J. (ed.), *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, 249–68.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2007), 'Epigram and the Theater', in Bing P. and Bruss J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 477–95.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2008), 'La doppia gloria di Menas (e di Filostrato)', in Morelli, A. M. (ed.), *Epigramma longum: Da Marziale alla tarda antichità/From Martial to Late Antiquity: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 29–31 maggio 2006*, 2 vols (Collana Scientifica 21), Cassino, 603–22.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2010), 'Typologies of Variation on a Theme in Archaic and Classical Metrical Inscriptions', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 289–310.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2002), *Muse e modelli: La poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto*, Rome.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2004 [2002]), *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Sens, A. (2006), 'The Hexameter of Inscribed Hellenistic Epigram', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Beyond the Canon* (Hellenistica Groningana 11), Leuven, 105–22.
- Fasce, S. (1977), *Eros: La figura e il culto* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medievale 49), Genoa.
- Favreau-Linder, A.-M. (2003), 'Trois relectures rhétoriques d'un exemplum historique: Cynégire et Callimaque, d'Athènes à Byzance', *Ktema* 28, 143–54.
- Fearn, D. (2013), 'Kleos Versus Stone? Lyric Poetry and Contexts for Memorialization', in Liddel, P. and Low, P. (eds), *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford, 231–53.
- Fedeli, P. (ed.) (1981), 'Attis e il leone: Dall'epigramma ellenistico al c. 63 di Catullo', in *Litterature comparate: Problemi e metodo: Studi in onore di Ettore Paratore*, 4 vols, Bologna, vol. 1, 247–56.
- Fernández-Galiano, E. (ed.) (1987), *Posidipo de Pela* (Manuales y Anejos de 'Emerita' 36), Madrid.
- Fitzgerald, W. (2007), *Martial: The World of the Epigram*, Chicago, IL.
- Floridi, L. (ed.) (2007), *Stratone di Sardi: Epigrammi: Testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Hellenica 24), Alessandria.
- Floridi, L. (2010), 'Rivisitazione delle convenzioni epigrammatiche nel sottogenere scoptico', *MD* 65, 9–42.
- Floridi, L. (2013a), 'Considerazioni sul rapporto tra gli epigrammi scoptici sui 'piccoli' e le arti figurative', *MD* 70, 179–98.
- Floridi, L. (2013b), 'Ludificata sequor verba aliena meis: Jeux avec les conventions et conscience de l'artifice dans quelques épigrammes d'Ausone inspirées de la tradition grecque', in Guipponi-Gineste, M.-F. and Urlacher-Becht, C. (eds), *La Renaissance de l'épigramme dans la latinité tardive: Actes du colloque de Mulhouse (6–7 octobre 2011)* (EAHA 23), Paris, 89–106.

- Floridi, L. (2013c), 'Il realismo dell'arte e il paradosso del retore muto', *Prometheus* 39, 87–106.
- Floridi, L. (ed.) (2014a), *Lucillio: Epigrammi: Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Texte und Kommentare 47), Berlin.
- Floridi, L. (2014b), Review of Wilkinson, K. W. (2012), *The New Epigrams of Palladas: A Fragmentary Papyrus Codex* (P. CtYBR inv. 4000), *Classical Journal Online* 2014.04.07, 1–6.
- Floridi, L. (2015a), 'A proposito di una riscrittura di Sapph. fr. 31 Voigt nel cosiddetto "Nuovo Pallada"', *Analecta Papyrologica* 27, 57–67.
- Floridi, L. (2015b), 'Un saggio di scultura verbale: A proposito di Luc. Im. 9', *Hermes* 143, 83–100.
- Floridi, L. (2016), 'Considerazioni in margine alla datazione di Pallada di Alessandria', *ZPE* 197, 51–69.
- Floridi, L. (forthcoming), 'Early Hellenistic Epigram: Themes and Genres', in Perale, M., Kwapisz, J., Taietti, G., and Cartlidge, B. (eds), *Hellenistic Poetry before Callimachus: Proceedings of an International Conference at the University of Liverpool, 14–15 June 2016*, Cambridge.
- Floridi, L. and Maltomini, F. (2016 [2014]), 'Sui contenuti e l'organizzazione interna di P.Vindob. G 40611 (CPR XXXIII)', *Aegyptus* 94, 19–62.
- Föllinger, S. (2009), 'Tears and Crying in Archaic Greek Poetry (especially Homer)', in Fögen, T. (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World*, Berlin, 17–36.
- Folch, M. (2015), *The City and the Stage: Performance, Genre, and Gender in Plato's Laws*, Oxford.
- Foley, H. P. (ed.) (1993), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretive Essays*, Princeton, NJ.
- Forster, E. S. (1945), 'Riddles and Problems from the Greek Anthology', *G&R* 14, 42–7.
- Fowler, D. P. (1995), 'Martial and the Book', *Ramus* 24, 31–58.
- Fränkel, H. F. (1915), *De Simia Rhodio*, Diss., Göttingen.
- Frangoulidis, S. and Harrison, S. (eds) (2018), *Intratextuality in Roman Literature*, Berlin.
- Franke, A. (1899), *De Pallada epigrammatographo*, Diss., Leipzig.
- Fraser, P. M. (1972), *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols, Oxford.
- Friedländer, P. (1942), 'A New Epigram by Damagetus', *AJPh* 63, 78–82.
- Friedländer, P. and Hoffleit, H. B. (eds) (1948), *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars*, Berkeley, CA.
- Friedrich, P. (1978), *The Meaning of Aphrodite*, Chicago, IL.
- Fröhner, W. (1884), *Kritische Analekten* (Philologus Supplbd. 5.1), Göttingen.
- Fuchs, W. (1958), *Der Dornauszieher* (Opus nobile: Meisterwerke der antiken Kunst 8), Bremen.
- Furley, W. D. (2010), 'Life in a Line: A Reading of Dedicatory Epigrams from the Archaic and Classical Period', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 151–66.
- Gabathuler, M. (1937), *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*, Diss. Basel, St. Gallen.
- Gärtner, T. (2007), 'Zur Deutung des kallimacheischen Epigramms über die *Phainomena* des Arat', *AC* 76, 157–62.
- Galán Vioque, G. (ed.) (2001), *Dioscórides: Epigramas* (Arias Montano 54), Huelva.

- Gall, D. (1999), 'Catullus Attis-Gedicht im Licht der Quellen', *WJA* 23, 83–99.
- Galli Calderini, I. G. (1983), 'Edilo epigrammista', *AAP* 32, 363–76.
- Galli Calderini, I. G. (1984), 'Gli epigrammi di Edilo: Interpretazione ed esegesi', *AAP* 33, 79–118.
- Galli Calderini, I. G. (1992), 'Retorica e realtà negli epigrammi di Agazia Scolastico', *AAP* 41, 113–27.
- Garland, L. (2011), 'Public Lavatories, Mosquito Nets and Agathias' Cat: The Sixth-Century Epigram in its Justinianic Context', in Nathan, G. and Garland, L. (eds), *Basileia: Essays on Imperium and Culture in honour of E. M. and M. J. Jeffreys* (Byzantina Australiensia 17), Brisbane, 141–58.
- Garland, R. (2010 [1995]), *The Eye of the Beholder: Deformity and Disability in the Graeco-Roman World*, London.
- Garulli, V. (ed.) (2004), *Il Περὶ ποιητῶν di Lobone di Argo* (Eikasmos 10), Bologna.
- Garulli, V. (2007), 'Cleombroto di Ambracia e il "lector in fabula" in Callimaco (Call. 'epigr.' 23 Pf.)', *Lexis* 25, 325–36.
- Garulli, V. (2008), 'L'epigramma longum nella tradizione epigrafica sepolcrale greca', in Morelli, A. M. (ed.), *Epigramma longum: Da Marziale alla tarda antichità/From Martial to Late Antiquity: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 29–31 maggio 2006*, 2 vols (Collana Scientifica 21), Cassino, 623–62.
- Garulli, V. (2012), *Byblos lainee: Epigrafia, letteratura, epitafio* (Eikasmos 20), Bologna.
- Garulli, V. (2014a), 'Gli epitafi greci per animali: Fra tradizione epigrafica e letteraria', in Pistellato, A. (ed.), *Memoria poetica e poesia della memoria: La versificazione epigrafica dall'antichità all'umanesimo* (Studi di Archivistica, Bibliografia e Paleografia 3), Venice, 27–64.
- Garulli, V. (2014b), 'Stones as Books: The Layout of Hellenistic Inscribed Poems', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Hellenistic Poetry in Context* (Hellenistica Groningana 20), Leuven, 125–69.
- Garulli, V. (2016), 'Posidippe, auteur épigraphique?', in Santin, E. and Foschia, L. (eds), *L'Épigramme dans tous ses états: Épigraphiques, littéraires, historiques*, Lyon, 60–87.
- Geffcken, J. (ed.) (1896), *Leonidas von Tarent*, Leipzig.
- Geffcken, J. (ed.) (1916), *Griechische Epigramme* (Kommentierte griechische und lateinische Texte 3), Heidelberg.
- Genette, G. (1987), *Seuils*, Paris.
- Genette, G. (1997 [1987]), *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. by J. E. Lewin, (foreword by R. Macksey), Cambridge.
- Gentili, B. (1968), 'Epigramma ed elegia', in Raubitschek, A. E. et al. (eds), *L'Épigramme grecque* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 14), Vandoeuvres Geneva, 37–90.
- Geoghegan, D. (ed.) (1979), *Anyte: The Epigrams* (Testi e commenti 4), Rome.
- Georgoudi, S. (1988), 'La Mer, la mort et le discours des épigrammes funéraires', *AION (archeol)* 10, 53–61.
- Giangrande, G. (1968), 'Sympotic Literature and Epigram', in Raubitschek, A. E. et al. (eds), *L'Épigramme grecque* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 14), Vandoeuvres Geneva, 91–177.

- Giannantoni, G. (ed.) (1990), *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae* (Elenchos 18), 4 vols, Naples.
- Giannuzzi, M. E. (ed.) (2007), *Stratone di Sardi: Epigrammi* (Satura 7), Lecce.
- Gibson, R. K. (ed.) (2003), *Ovid: Ars amatoria, Book 3* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 40), Cambridge.
- Gigante, M. (ed.) (1970), *Filodemo: Epigrammi scelti*, Naples. 2nd edn 1988.
- Giommoni, F. (ed.) (2017), *Νέγς γενετήρες ἀοιδῆς: Gli epigrammi dei 'minori' del Ciclo di Agazia* (Hellenica 67), Alessandria.
- Gleason, M. (2010), 'Making Space for Bicultural Identity: Herodes Atticus Commemorates Regilla', in Whitmarsh, T. (ed.), *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World* (Greek Culture in the Roman World), Cambridge, 125–62.
- Goldberg, C. (1993), *Turandot's Sisters: A Study of the Folktale AT 851* (Routledge Library Editions: Folklore), New York.
- Goldhill, S. (1994), 'The Naive and Knowing Eye: Ekphrasis and the Culture of Viewing in the Hellenistic World', in Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. (eds), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge Studies in New Art History and Criticism), Cambridge, 197–223 and 304–9.
- Goldhill, S. (2007), 'What Is Ekphrasis for?', *CPh* 102, 1–19.
- Gonnelli, F. (ed.) (2003), *Nonno di Panopoli: Le Dionisiache*, vol. 2: *Canti XIII–XXIV* (BUR Classici Greci e Latini 1473), Milan.
- González Rincón, M. (ed.) (1996), *Estratón de Sardes: Epigramas* (Literatura 14), Seville.
- Gosetti-Murrayjohn, A. (2006), 'Sappho as the Tenth Muse in Hellenistic Epigram', *Arethusa* 39, 21–45.
- Gow, A. S. F. (ed.) (1952 [1950]), *Theocritus*, 2 vols, Cambridge.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1958), 'Leonidas of Tarentum', *CQ* 8, 113–23.
- Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. (eds) (1965), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols, Cambridge.
- Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. (eds) (1968), *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, 2 vols, Cambridge.
- Gowers, E. (1993), *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*, Oxford.
- Goyens-Slezakowa, C. (1990–1), 'La Mer et les îles, un lieu du mal et du malheur: Théâtre et realia', in Ghiron-Bistagne, P. (ed.), *Realia: Mélanges sur les réalités du théâtre antique: Archéologie, épigraphie, anthropologie, littérature* (Cahiers du Groupe Interdisciplinaire du Théâtre Antique 6), 81–126, Montpellier.
- Graefe, F. (ed.) (1811), *Meleagri Gadareni epigrammata*, Leipzig.
- Greatrex, G. (1998), *Rome and Persia at War, 502–532* (ARCA: Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 37), Leeds.
- Greco, C. (2013), 'L'Art qui force la nature, ou de la création d'un paysage littéraire dans l'épigramme grecque des V^e et VI^e siècles', in Garambois-Vasquez, F. and Vallat, D. (eds), *Le Lierre et la statue: La Nature et son espace littéraire dans l'épigramme gréco-latine tardive* (Mémoires du Centre Jean Palerne 37), Saint-Étienne, 251–62.
- Green, R. P. H. (ed.) (1991), *The Works of Ausonius*, Oxford.
- Greene, E. (2005 [2000]), 'Playing with Tradition: Gender and Innovation in the Epigrams of Anyte', in Greene, E. (ed.), *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Norman, 139–57. Original publication in *Helios* 27, 15–32.

- Griffin, M. T. (1984), *Nero: The End of a Dynasty*, London.
- Gronewald, M. (2001), 'Bemerkungen zum neuen Poseidippos', *ZPE* 137, 1–5.
- Grossardt, P. (ed.) (2006), *Einführung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Heroikos von Flavius Philostrat*, 2 vols (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 33), Basel.
- Guarducci, M. (1929), 'Poeti vaganti e conferenzieri dell'età ellenistica: Ricerche di epigrafia greca nel campo della letteratura e del costume', *RAL* 6, 629–65.
- Guarducci, M. (1969), 'I pomi delle Esperidi in un epigramma di Lucillio', *RAL* 24, 3–8.
- Guéraud, O. and Jouguet, P. (1938), *Un livre d'écolier du III^e siècle avant J.-C.* (Publications de la Société Royale Égyptienne de Papyrologie, Textes et Documents 2), Cairo.
- Guichard, L. A. (2000), 'Intertextualidad y antologación en la *Corona* de Meleagro', in Bécaries, V., Pordomingo, F., Cortés Tovar, R., and Fernández Corte, J. C. (eds), *Intertextualidad en las literaturas griega y latina* (Classica Salmanticensia 2), Madrid, 105–19.
- Guichard, L. A. (ed.) (2004), *Asclepiades de Samos: Epigramas y fragmentos* (Saphe-neia: Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 10), Bern.
- Guichard, L. A. (2017), 'From School to Desacralisation, or How Palladas Read Homer', in Durbec, Y. and Trajber, F. (eds), *Traditions épiques et poésie épigrammatique: Actes du colloque des 7, 8 et 9 novembre 2012 à Aix-en-Provence* (Hellenistica Groningana 22), Leuven, 157–70.
- Guidorizzi, G. (ed.) (1992), *Meleagro: Epigrammi* (Classici Greci e Latini 28), Milan.
- Gulick, C. B. (ed., trans.) (1930), *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists*, vol. 4 (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge, MA.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (1993), 'Anyte's Epigram Book', *SyllClass* 4, 71–89.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (1997), 'The Poetics of Editing in Meleager's *Garland*', *TAPhA* 127, 169–200.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (1998), *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 28), Berkeley, CA.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2000), 'The Tragic Mask of Comedy: Metatheatricality in Menander', *ClAnt* 19, 102–37.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2002), 'Art's Echo: The Tradition of Hellenistic Ecphrastic Epigram', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Hellenistica Groningana 6), Leuven, 85–112.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2004a), 'A New Hellenistic Poetry Book: P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309', in Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M. (eds), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309) (Hellenic Studies 2), Washington, DC, 84–93.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2004b), 'Seeing Thought: Timomachus' Medea and Ecphrastic Epigram', *AJPh* 125, 339–86.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2005a), 'The Literariness of the Milan Papyrus, or "What Difference a Book?"', in Gutzwiller, K. J. (ed.), *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, 287–319.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (ed.) (2005b), *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2005c), Review of Nisbet, G. (2003), *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire: Martial's Forgotten Rivals*, *BMCRev* 2005.01.19.

- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2007a), *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature* (Blackwell Guides to Classical Literature), Malden, MA.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2007b), 'The Paradox of Amatory Epigram', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 313–32.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2008), Review of Garulli, V. (2004), *Il Περὶ ποιητῶν δι Lobone di Argo*, *BMCRev* 2008.01.48.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2010a), 'Heroic Epitaphs of the Classical Age: The Aristotelian *Peplos* and Beyond', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 219–49.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2010b), 'Images poétiques et réminiscences artistiques dans les épigrammes de Méléagre', in Prioux, É. and Rouveret, A. (eds), *Métamorphoses du regard ancien* (Modernité classique), Nanterre, 67–112.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2012), 'Catullus and the Garland of Meleager', in Du Quesnay, I. and Woodman, T. (eds), *Catullus: Poems, Books, and Readers*, Cambridge, 79–111.
- Häusle, H. (1979), *Einfache und frühe Formen des griechischen Epigramms* (Commentationes Aenipontanae 25: Philologie und Epigraphik 3), Innsbruck.
- Hahn, J. (2008), 'The Conversion of the Cult Statues: The Destruction of the Serapeum 392 AD [sic] and the Transformation of Alexandria into the "Christ-Loving" City', in Hahn, J., Emmel, S., and Gotter, U. (eds), *From Temple to Church: Destruction and Renewal of Local Cultic Topography in Late Antiquity* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 163), Leiden, 335–65.
- Halliwell, S. (2011), *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus*, Oxford.
- Hamilton, R. (2000), *Treasure Map: A Guide to the Delian Inventories*, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Handley, E. W. (1996), 'Two Epigrams by Asclepiades (XXV, XVI G.-P.)', *MH* 53, 140–7.
- Hansen, B. (1914), *De Leonida Tarentino*, Diss., Leipzig.
- Harder, M. A. (ed.) (1985), *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 87), Leiden.
- Harder, M. A. (2005 [2004]), 'Catullus 63: A 'Hellenistic Poem'?', in Nauta, R. R. and Harder, A. (eds), *Catullus' Poem on Attis: Text and Contexts*, Leiden, 65–86. Original publication in *Mnemosyne* 57, 574–95.
- Harder, M. A. (2007), 'Epigram and the Heritage of Epic', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 409–28.
- Harder, M. A. (ed.) (2012), *Callimachus: Aetia*, 2 vols, Oxford.
- Harder, M. A. (2017), 'Big Heroes in a Small Format', in Durbec, Y. and Trajber, F. (eds), *Traditions épiques et poésie épigrammatique* (Hellenistica Groningana 22), Leuven, 87–98.
- Harder, M. A. (forthcoming) 'Taking Position: Later Hellenistic Epigrammatists', in Henriksén, C. (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epigram* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Oxford.
- Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds) (2002), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Hellenistica Groningana 6), Leuven.
- Harrison, E. B. (1972), 'The South Frieze of the Nike Temple and the Marathon Painting in the Painted Stoa', *AJA* 76, 353–78.

- Harrison, S. (2005a [2004]), 'Altering Attis: Ethnicity, Gender, and Genre in Catullus 63', in Nauta, R. R. and Harder, A. (eds), *Catullus' Poem on Attis: Text and Contexts*, Leiden, 11–24. Original publication in *Mnemosyne* 57, 520–33.
- Harrison, S. (2005b [2004]), 'Catullus 63: Text and Translation', in Nauta, R. R. and Harder, A. (eds), *Catullus' Poem on Attis: Text and Contexts*, Leiden, 2–7. Original publication in *Mnemosyne* 57, 514–19.
- Harrison, T. (trans.) (1992 [1975]), *Palladas: Poems* (Poetica 5), London.
- Hatzikosta, S. (ed.) (2005), *Θεοκρίτου Ειδύλλια: Εισαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια. Ειδύλλια I–VII*, Athens.
- Havelock, C. M. (1995), *The Aphrodite of Knidos and her Successors: A Historical Review of the Female Nude in Greek Art*, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Headlam, W. (trans.) (1890), *Fifty Poems of Meleager*, London.
- Heiden, B. (2000), 'The Placement of "Book Divisions" in the *Odyssey*', *CPh* 95, 247–59.
- Heitsch, E. (ed.) (1961–4 [1963]), *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, rev. edn, 2 vols, Göttingen.
- Helly, B. (1992), 'Stèles funéraires de Démétrias: Recherches sur la chronologie des remparts et des nécropoles méridionales de la ville', in Doulgeri-Intzesiloglou, A. et al. (eds), *Διεθνές Συνέδριο για την αρχαία Θεσσαλία στη μνήμη του Δημήτρη Ρ. Θεοχάρη (Δημοσιεύματα του Αρχαιολογικού Δελτίου 48, Έκδοση του Ταμείου Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων)*, Athens, 349–65 and pl. 78–80.
- Helm, R. (1906), *Lucian und Menipp*, Leipzig.
- Henderson, J. (1991 [1975]), *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New York.
- Henderson, W. J. (2008), 'Epigrammatic *psogos*: Censure in the Epigrams of Palladas of Alexandria', *AClass* 51, 91–116.
- Henderson, W. J. (forthcoming), 'Imagery in the Yale Papyrus Codex: A Semiotic Probe', in Kanellou, M. and Carey, C. (eds), *Palladas and the Papyrus Codex P. CtYBR inv. 4000*.
- Henrichs, A. (1995), '*Graecia capta*: Roman Views of Greek Culture', *HSPH* 97, 243–61.
- Henriksén, C. (2012), *A Commentary on Martial: Epigrams, Book 9*, Oxford.
- Henriksén, C. (ed.) (forthcoming), *A Companion to Ancient Epigram* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Oxford.
- Henry, W. B. (2003), 'Two Verse Inscriptions (*I. Oropos* 675, *SEG* 49. 1976)', *ZPE* 145, 10–12.
- Herrmann, L. (1951), 'Anthologie Palatine, VII, 233 et 234', *AC* 20, 101–2.
- Hicks, R. D. (ed., trans.) (1925), *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 2 vols (Loeb Classical Library 184–5), Cambridge, MA.
- Higbie, C. (1999), 'Craterus and the Use of Inscriptions in Ancient Scholarship', *TAPhA* 129, 43–83.
- Higbie, C. (2010), 'Epigrams on the Persian Wars: Monuments, Memory and Politics', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 183–201.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. (1912), 'Ardeikes und Hieronymos von Rhodos', *BCH* 36, 230–9.

- Hillscher, A. (1892), 'Hominum litteratorum graecorum ante Tiberii mortem in urbe Roma commoratorum historia critica', in Fleckeisen, A. (ed.), *Jahrbuch für klassische Philologie* (Suppl. 18), Leipzig, 355–440.
- Hiltbrunner, O. (1972), 'Einladung zum epikureischen Freundesmahl (Thema mit Variationen)', in Hanslik, v. R., Lesky, A., and Schwabl, H. (eds), *Antidosi: Festschrift für Walther Kraus zum 70. Geburtstag* (Wiener Studien 5), Vienna, 168–82.
- Hine, D. (trans.) (2001), *Puerilities: Erotic Epigrams of the Greek Anthology*, Princeton, NJ.
- Hirsch, E. (1966), 'Zum Kranz des Philippos', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Halle* 15, 401–17.
- Hörschele, R. (2006), *Verrückt nach Frauen: Der Epigrammatiker Rufin* (Classica Monacensia 31), Tübingen.
- Hörschele, R. (2010), *Die blütenlesende Muse: Poetik und Textualität antiker Epigrammsammlungen* (Classica Monacensia 37), Tübingen.
- Hörschele, R. (2016), "'Unplumbed Depths of Fatuity?'" Philip of Thessaloniki's Art of Variation', in Sistakou, E. and Rengakos, A. (eds), *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 43), Berlin, 105–17.
- Hörschele, R. (2017), "'Harvesting from a New Page": Philip of Thessalonike's Editorial Undertaking', *Aitia* 7. <http://journals.openedition.org/aitia/1727>.
- Hörschele, R. (2018), 'Poets' Corners in Greek Epigram Collections', in Goldschmidt, N. and Graziosi, B. (eds), *Tombs of the Poets: Between Text and Material Culture*, Oxford, 197–215.
- Hopkinson, N. (ed.) (1994), *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period: An Anthology* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), Cambridge.
- Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A., and Eidinow, E. (eds) (2014), *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilisation*, Oxford.
- Howard-Johnston, J. (2010), *Witnesses to a World Crisis: Historians and Histories of the Middle East in the Seventh Century*, Oxford.
- Hubaux, J. (1921), 'Virgile et Méléagre de Gadara', *Musée Belge* 25, 149–63.
- Hünemörder, C. (1999), 'Lithika', in Cancik, H. and Schneider, H. (eds), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, vol. 7, Stuttgart, 353–4.
- Hunger, H. (1977), 'Epigraphische Auszeichnungsmajuskel: Beitrag zu einem bisher kaum beachteten Kapitel der griechischen Paläographie', *JÖByz* 26, 193–210.
- Hunter, R. L. (ed.) (1983), *Eubulus: The Fragments* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 24), Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. (1993), *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. (ed.) (1999), *Theocritus: A Selection. Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. (2003), 'Literature and its Contexts', in Erskine, A. (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Oxford, 477–93.
- Hunter, R. L. (2004), 'Notes on the *Lithika* of Poseidippos', in Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M. (eds), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309) (Hellenic Studies 2), Washington, DC, 94–104. Repr. in Hunter, R. L. (2008), *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and Its Reception*, 2 vols (Trends in Classics Suppl. 3), Berlin, 457–69.

- Hunter, R. L. (2010), 'Language and Interpretation in Greek Epigram', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 265–88.
- Hunter, R. L. (2014), *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days* (Cambridge Classical Studies), Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. (2018), *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. and Rutherford, I. (eds) (2009), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, Cambridge.
- Huys, M. and Nodar, A. (2007), 'A Catalogue of Paraliterary Payri (CPP): Presentation of the Project', in Frösén, J., Purola, T., and Salmenkivi, E. (eds), *Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1–7 August 2004*, 2 vols (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 122), Helsinki, 453–61.
- Ihm, S. (ed.) (2004), *Eros und Distanz: Untersuchungen zu Asklepiades in seinem Kreis* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 167), Munich.
- Jacobs, C. F. W. (ed.) (1794–1814), *Anthologia graeca sive poetarum graecorum lusus ex recensione Brunckii: Animadversiones in epigrammata Anthologiae graecae secundum ordinem analectorum Brunckii*, 13 vols, Leipzig.
- Jacobs, C. F. W. (ed.) (1798), *Animadversiones in epigrammata Anthologiae graecae secundum ordinem analectorum Brunckii*, vol. 1.1, Leipzig.
- Jacobs, C. F. W. (ed.) (1803), *Animadversiones in epigrammata Anthologiae graecae secundum ordinem analectorum Brunckii*, vol. 3.2, Leipzig.
- Jacobs, C. F. W. (ed.) (1813–17), *Anthologia graeca ad fidem Codicis olim Palatini nunc Parisini ex apographo gothano edita*, 3 vols, Leipzig.
- Jacobs, C. F. W. (ed.) (1826), *Delectus epigrammatum graecorum: Quem novo ordine concinnavit et commentariis in usum scholarum instruxit*, Gotha.
- James, L. and Webb, R. (1991), "'To Understand Ultimate Things and Enter Secret Places": Ekphrasis and Art in Byzantium', *Art History* 14.1, 1–17.
- Janin, R. (1964 [1950]), *Constantinople byzantine: Développement urbain et répertoire topographique* (Archives de l'Orient chrétien 4 A), Paris.
- Jeffreys, M. J. (1974), 'The Nature and Origins of the Political Verse', *DOP* 28, 141–95.
- Joyal, M. (2014), "'Genuine" and "Bastard" Dialogues in the Platonic Corpus: An Inquiry into the Origins and Meaning of a Concept', in Martínez, J. (ed.), *Fakes and Forgers of Classical Literature: Ergo decipiatur! (Metaforms: Studies in the Reception of Classical Antiquity 2)*, Leiden, 73–93.
- Kaczko, S. (2009), 'From Stone to Parchment: Epigraphic and Literary Transmission of Some Greek Epigrams', in Montanari, F. and Rengakos, A. (eds), *Trends in Classics*, vol. 1, 90–117.
- Kaczko, S. (ed.) (2016), *Archaic and Classical Attic Dedicatory Epigrams: An Epigraphic, Literary and Linguistic Commentary* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 33), Berlin.
- Kaegi, W. E. (2003), *Heraclius: Emperor of Byzantium*, Cambridge.
- Kaibel, G. (ed.) (1878), *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin.
- Kaibel, G. (ed.) (1885), *Philodemi Gadarensis epigrammata*, Greifswald.
- Kamp, J. (1875), 'Ein Ganymed-Torso in Köln', in *Festschrift mit welcher zu der am 18. und 19. Oktober d. J. stattfindenden Feier des 50jährigen Bestehens des Friedrich-Wilhelms Gymnasiums zu Köln*, Cologne, 81–7.

- Kanellou, M. (2012), *Erotic Epigram: A Study of Motifs*, Diss., London.
- Kanellou, M. (2013), 'Lamp and Erotic Epigram: How an Object Sheds Light on the Lover's Emotions', in Sanders, E., Thumiger, C., Carey, C., and Lowe, N. J. (eds), *Erôs in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 277–92.
- Kanellou, M. (2014), Review of Wilkinson, K. W. (2012), *New Epigrams of Palladas: A Fragmentary Papyrus Codex (P. CtYBR inv. 4000)*, CW 108, 134–5.
- Kanellou, M. (2016), 'Ερμύονην, ἣ εἶδος ἔχε χρυσέης Ἀφροδίτης (Od. 4.14): Praising a Female through Aphrodite: From Homer into Hellenistic Epigram', in Efstathiou, A. and Karamanou, I. (eds), *Homeric Receptions across Generic and Cultural Contexts* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 37), Berlin, 189–204.
- Kanellou, M. (forthcoming), 'Tombe/tombeau (Grave/Tombstone)', in Guez, J.-P., Klein, F., Peigney, J., and Prioux, E. (eds), *Dictionnaire des images métapoétiques anciennes*, Paris.
- Kanellou, M. and Carey, C. (eds) (forthcoming), *Palladas and the Papyrus Codex P. CtYBR inv. 4000*.
- Kantzios, I. (2005), *The Trajectory of Archaic Greek Trimeters* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 265), Leiden.
- Karamanou, I. (ed.) (2006), *Euripides: Danae and Dictys* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 228), Munich.
- Kassel, R. (1983), 'Dialoge mit Statuen', ZPE 51, 1–12.
- Kauppinen, S. (2015), *Dialogue Form in Greek Verse Inscriptions with Some Non-Insitutional Parallels*, Diss., Helsinki.
- Keesling, C. M. (2010), 'The Callimachus Monument on the Athenian Acropolis (CEG 256) and Athenian Commemoration of the Persian Wars', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 100–30.
- Keil, B. (1902), 'Κόρον πεδίον', RPh 26, 257–62.
- Keith, A. (ed.) (2011), *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram: A Tale of Two Genres at Rome*, Newcastle.
- Kemke, J. (ed.) (1884), *Philodemi De musica librorum quae exstant*, Leipzig.
- Kenaan, V. L. (2011), 'Thauma Idesthai: The Mythical Origins of Philosophical Wonder', in Kenaan, H. and Ferber, I. (eds), *Philosophy's Moods: The Affective Grounds of Thinking* (Contributions to Phenomenology 63), Dordrecht, 13–26.
- Kerkhecker, A. (1999), *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*, Oxford.
- Keydell, R. (1935), 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', Hermes 70, 301–11.
- Kirstein, R. (2008), "'Der mitdenkende Leser": Überlegungen zum antiken Rätselepi-gramm', Hermes 136, 466–83.
- Knauer, O. (ed.) (1935), *Die Epigramme des Asklepiades von Samos*, Würzburg.
- Knox, P. E. (1985), 'Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics', HSPH 89, 107–19.
- Köhnken, A. (2007), 'Epinician Epigram', in Bing P. and Bruss J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 295–312.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000), *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*, Cambridge.
- Komines, A. D. (1966), *Τὸ βυζαντινὸν ἱερὸν ἐπίγραμμα καὶ οἱ ἐπιγραμματοποιοί*, Athens.

- Konstan, D. (2006), *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (Robson Classical Lectures), Toronto.
- Konstan, D. (2011), 'Socrates in Aristophanes' *Clouds*', in Morrison, D. R. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates* (Cambridge Companions to Philosophy), Cambridge, 75–90.
- Konstantakos, I. M. (2002), 'Towards a Literary History of Comic Love', *C&M* 53, 141–71.
- Konstantakos, I. M. (2003–4), 'This Craft of Comic Verse: Greek Comic Poets on Comedy', *Archaïgnosia* 12, 11–53.
- Konstantakos, I. M. (2014), 'Comedy in the Fourth Century, I: Mythological Burlesques', in Fontaine, M. and Scafuro, A. C. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, Oxford, 160–80.
- Kosmetatou, E. (2013), 'Herodotus and Temple Inventories', in Liddel, P. and Low, P. (eds), *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents), Oxford, 65–77.
- Kosmetatou, E. (2015), 'An Unlikely Muse: Temple Inventories, Their Readers, and Literary Epigram'. Paper presented at the SCS Annual Meeting, New Orleans.
- Krämer, J. (1992), 'Affektenlehren', in Ueding, G. (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol. 1: A–Bib, Tübingen, 248–53.
- Krevans, N. (1984), *The Poet as Editor: Callimachus, Virgil, Horace, Propertius and the Development of the Poetic Book*, Diss., Princeton, NJ.
- Kroll, W. (1924), *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart.
- Kwapisz, J. (2008), 'Muse vs Muses in the P. Berol. inv. 13270', *ZPE* 164, 45–6.
- Kwapisz, J. (ed.) (2013a), *The Greek Figure Poems* (Hellenistica Groningana 19), Leuven.
- Kwapisz, J. (2013b), 'Were There Hellenistic Riddle Books?', in Kwapisz, J., Petrain, D., and Szymański, M. (eds), *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 305), Berlin, 148–67.
- Kwapisz, J. (2016), 'When is a Riddle an Epigram?', in Sistikou, E. and Rengakos, A. (eds), *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 43), Berlin, 151–72.
- Labellarte, R. (ed.) (1969), *Leonida di Taranto: Antologia di epigrammi*, Bari.
- Lamagna, M. (ed.) (1998), *Menandro: La donna di Samo* (Hellenica et Byzantina Neapolitana 17), Naples.
- Lambros, S. P. (1923), 'Αινίγματα', *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* 17, 202–17.
- Lane, E. N. (1996), 'The name of Cybele's Priests the "Galloi"', in Lane, E. N. (ed.), *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults: Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaseren* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 131), Leiden, 117–33.
- Lapini, W. (ed.) (2007), *Capitoli su Posidippo* (Hellenica 25), Alessandria.
- Lasserre, F. (1944), 'Ἑρωτικοὶ λόγοι', *MH* 1, 169–78.
- Lasserre, F. (1946), *La Figure d'Éros dans la poésie grecque*, Diss., Lausanne.
- Lattimore, R. A. (1942), *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 28.1–2), Urbana. Electronic version 1962.
- Laurens, P. (1965), 'Martial et l'épigramme grecque du 1^{er} siècle ap. J. C.', *REL* 43, 315–41.
- Laurens, P. (1989), *L'Abeille dans l'ombre: Célébration de l'épigramme de l'époque alexandrine à la fin de la Renaissance*, Paris. Rev. edn 2012.

- Lausberg, M. (1982), *Das Einzeldistichon: Studien zum antiken Epigramm* (Studia et Testimonia Antiqua 19), Munich.
- Lauxtermann, M. D. (1998), 'What is an Epideictic Epigram?', *Mnemosyne* 51, 525–37.
- Lauxtermann, M. D. (1999), *The Spring of Rhythm: An Essay on the Political Verse and Other Byzantine Metres* (Byzantina Vindobonensia 22), Vienna.
- Lauxtermann, M. D. (2003), *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres: Texts and Contexts*, vol. 1 (Wiener byzantinistische Studien 24.1), Vienna.
- Lauxtermann, M. D. (2007), 'The Anthology of Cephalas', in Hinterberger, M. and Schiffer, E. (eds), *Byzantinische Sprachkunst: Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag* (Byzantisches Archiv 20), Berlin, 194–208.
- Leary, T. J. (1998), 'Martial's Early Saturnalian Verse', in Grewing, F. (ed.), *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation* (Palingenesia 65), Stuttgart, 37–47.
- Leary, T. J. (ed.) (2014), *Symphosius: The Aenigmata: An Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Bloomsbury Classical Studies Monographs), London.
- Lee, R. W. (1967), *Ut pictura poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting* (Norton Library 399), New York.
- Légrand, P.-E. (1901), 'Sur quelques épigrammes du III^e siècle', *REA* 3, 185–95.
- Le Guen, B. (2001), *Les Associations de Technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique*, 2 vols (Études d'archéologie classique 11), Nancy.
- Le Guen-Pollet, B. (1989), 'Sebastopolis du Pont (Sulсарay): Documents littéraires et inscriptions déjà publiées de la cité', *EA* 13, 51–86.
- Lelli, E. (2005), 'Posidippo e Callimaco', in Di Marco, M., Palumbo Stracca, B. M., and Lelli, E. (eds), *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario: Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004* (= *Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6), Pisa, 77–132.
- Lenski, N. (2016), *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civil Politics* (Empire and After), Philadelphia.
- Lenzinger, F. (1965), *Zur griechischen Anthologie*, Zurich.
- Leone, P. L. M. (2002), *Scholia vetera et paraphrases in Lycophronis Alexandram*, Galatina.
- Lescure, J. (1973), 'Petite histoire de l'Oulipo', in Oulipo, *La Littérature potentielle: Créations re-créations récréations*, Paris, 28–40.
- LeVen, P. (2013), 'Aristotle's Hymn to Virtue and Funerary Inscriptions', in Liddel, P. and Low, P. (eds), *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford, 271–87.
- Liddel, P. and Low, P. (eds) (2013), *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents), Oxford.
- Linforth, I. M. (1946), *The Corybantic Rites in Plato* (University of California Publications in Classical Philology 13.5), Berkeley, CA.
- Littlewood, A. (2002), 'The Scholarship of Byzantine Gardens', in Littlewood, A., Maguire, H., and Wolschke-Bulmahn, J. (eds), *Byzantine Garden Culture*, Washington, DC, 13–22.
- Livingstone, N. (2010), 'Epigram in the Hellenistic World', in Livingstone, N. and Nisbet, G., *Epigram* (Greece & Rome: New Surveys in the Classics 38), Cambridge, 48–98.

- Livingstone, N. (2011), 'Silent Voices? Cultural Memory and the Reading of Inscribed Epigram in Classical Athens', in Bommas, M. (ed.), *Cultural Memory and Identity in Ancient Societies* (Cultural Memory and History in Antiquity 1), London, 26–42.
- Livingstone, N. and Nisbet, G. (2010), *Epigram* (Greece & Rome: New Surveys in the Classics 38), Cambridge.
- Livrea, E. (1987), 'La morte di Clitorio (SH 975)', *ZPE* 68, 21–8. Repr. in Livrea, E. (1991), *Studia Hellenistica* (Papyrologica Florentina 21), Florence, vol. 1, 259–65.
- Lloyd-Jones H. (ed., trans.) (1994), *Sophocles*, vol. 2: *Antigone, Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus* (Loeb Classical Library 21), Cambridge, MA.
- Lloyd-Jones H. (2001), 'Notes on P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309', *ZPE* 137, 6.
- Longo, A. R. (2004–5), 'Eros in Meleagro: Osservazioni sulla genesi e il significato di alcune immagini e metafore', *Rudiae* 16–17, 335–52.
- Longo, V. (1967), *L'epigramma scoptico greco* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di filologia classica dell'Università di Genova 24), Genoa.
- López Cruces, J. L. (2013), 'Heracleian Motifs in AP 11.158', *Mnemosyne* 66, 288–92.
- Lorenz, K. (2010), "'Dialectics at a Standstill": Archaic *Kouroi*-cum-epigram as *I-Box*', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 131–48.
- Lougovaya, J. (2013), 'Inscriptions on the Attic Stage', in Liddel, P. and Low, P. (eds), *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford, 255–70.
- Luck, G. (1958), 'Palladas: Christian or Pagan?', *HSPH* 63, 455–71.
- Lulli, L. (2009), 'Appunti per una storia grafico-editoriale del genere letterario dell'eglogia in età ellenistico-romana', *Scripta* 2, 135–57.
- Luz, C. (2010), *Technopaignia: Formspiele in der griechischen Dichtung* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 324), Leiden.
- Luz, C. (2013), 'Who Has it Got in its Pocketses? Or, What Makes a Riddle a Riddle?', in Kwapisz, J., Petrain, D., and Szymański, M. (eds), *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 305), Berlin, 83–99.
- Ma, J. (2007a), 'Hellenistic Honorific Statues and their Inscriptions', in Newby, Z. and Leader-Newby, R. (eds), *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 203–20.
- Ma, J. (2007b), 'The Worlds of Nestor the Poet', in Swain, S., Harrison, S., and Elsner, J. (eds), *Severan Culture*, Cambridge, 83–113.
- Ma, J. (2013), *Statues and Cities: Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World* (Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture and Representation), Oxford.
- Maas, P. (1903), 'Der byzantinische Zwölfsilber', *ByzZ* 12, 278–323.
- Maas, P. (1913), 'Das Epigramm auf Marcus εἰς ἑαυτόν', *Hermes* 48, 295–9.
- Macrides, R. and Magdalino, P. (1988), 'The Architecture of *Ekphrasis*: Construction and Context of Paul the Silentiary's Poem on Hagia Sophia', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 12, 47–82.
- Madden, J. A. (ed.) (1995), *Macedonius Consul: The Epigrams* (Spudasmata 60), Hildesheim.
- Männlein-Robert, I. (2007a), 'Epigrams on Art: Voice and Voicelessness in Ecphrastic Epigram', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 251–71.

- Männlein-Robert, I. (2007b), *Stimme, Schrift und Bild: Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtung* (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften 119), Heidelberg.
- Maffei, S. (1994), *Luciano di Samosata: Descrizioni di opere d'arte* (Nuova Universale Einaudi 217), Turin.
- Magini, D. (2000), 'Asclepiade e le origini dell'epigramma erotico greco', *Acme* 53, 17–37.
- Magnelli, E. (1999), 'Miscellanea critica', *Eikasmos* 10, 101–17.
- Magnelli, E. (2006), 'Il proemio della Corona di Filippo di Tessalonica e la sua funzione programmatica', in Cristante, L. (ed.), *Incontri triestini di filologia classica IV, 2004–2005: Atti del convegno internazionale Phantasia: Il pensiero per immagini degli antichi e dei moderni, Trieste, 28–30 aprile 2005* (Polymnia: Studi di Filologia Classica 6), Trieste, 393–404.
- Magnelli, E. (2007), 'Meter and Diction: From Refinement to Mannerism', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 165–83.
- Magnelli, E. (2008), 'I due proemi di Agazia e le due identità dell'epigramma tardoantico', in Morelli, A. M. (ed.), *Epigramma longum: Da Marziale alla tarda antichità/ From Martial to Late Antiquity: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 29–31 maggio 2006*, 2 vols (Collana Scientifica 21), Cassino, 559–70.
- Magnelli, E. (2013), 'Myth and History in Euphorion's Eastern Tales', in Cusset, C., Prioux, É., and Richer, H. (eds), *Euphorion et les mythes: Images et fragments: Actes du colloque international, Lyon, 19–20 janvier 2012* (Études: Centre Jean Bérard 9), Naples, 181–94.
- Maguire, H. (2000), 'Gardens and Parks in Constantinople', *DOP* 54, 251–64.
- Maltomini, F. (2008), *Tradizione antologica dell'epigramma greco: Le sillogi minori di età bizantina e umanistica* (Pleiadi 9), Rome.
- Maltomini, F. (2011), 'Nouvelles recherches sur les sylloges mineures d'épigrammes grecques', *RPh* 85, 295–318.
- Maltomini, F. (2015), 'Una silloge di epigrammi su Omero (e alcuni inediti bizantini)', *MD* 75, 151–75.
- Mango, C. A. (1963), 'Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder', *DOP* 17, 53–75.
- Mango, C. A. (1986a [1972]), *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312–1453: Sources and Documents*, Toronto.
- Mango, C. A. (1986b), 'Épigrammes honorifiques, statues et portraits à Byzance', in Kremmydas, V., Maltezou, C., and Panagiotakis, N. M. (eds), *Ἀφιέρωμα στὸν Νίκο Σβορώνο*, Rethymno, vol. 1, 23–35. Repr. in Mango, C. A. (1993), *Studies on Constantinople* (Variorum Collected Studies 394), Aldershot, ch. 9, 23–35.
- Mango, C. A. (1993), 'The Columns of Justinian and his Successors', in Mango, C. A. (ed.), *Studies on Constantinople* (Variorum Collected Studies 394), Aldershot, ch. 10, 1–20.
- Manso, J. K. F. (ed.) (1789), *Μελεάγρου τα σωζόμενα/Meleagri reliquiae: Lectionis varietatem versionem metricam et commentarium perpetuum adiecit*, Jena.
- Marcovich, M. (1982), 'Catullus 13 and Philodemus 23', *QUCC* 11, 131–8.
- Marek, C. (1993), 'Anhang 6: Katalog der Inschriften von Kaisareia/Hadrianopolis', in Marek, C., *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Istanbuler Forschungen 39), Tübingen, 187–210.

- Marino, S. and Stavru, A. (eds) (2013), *Ekphrasis* (Estetica: Studi e Ricerche 1), Rome.
- Marquardt, N. (1995), *Pan in der hellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Plastik* (Antiquitas 3.33), Bonn.
- Marrou, H.-I. (1948), *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Collections Esprit), Paris.
- Marrou, H.-I. (1966 [1948]), *Storia dell'educazione nell'antichità*, trans. U. Massi (Cultura Studium 15), Rome.
- Martin, A. (1996), *The Epigrams of Posidippus of Pella: A Commentary*, MA Diss., Dublin.
- Martin, R. P. (1989), *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Myth and Poetics), Ithaca, NY.
- Martindale, J. R. (1992), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 3: AD 527–641, Cambridge.
- Mateo Decabo, E. M. (2015), 'Nauagika (89–94)', in Seidensticker B., Stähli, A., and Wessels, A. (eds), *Der neue Poseidipp: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Texte zur Forschung 108), Darmstadt, 319–42.
- Matthews, V. J. (ed.) (1974), *Panyassis of Halikarnassos: Text and Commentary* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 33), Leiden.
- Mattsson, A. (1942), *Untersuchungen zur Epigrammsammlung des Agathias*, Diss., Lund.
- McCartney, E. S. (1922), 'Anthologia Palatina XIV. 30', CR 36, 165.
- McCartney, E. S. (1930), 'A Greek Enigma (Greek Anthology, XIV, 41)', CPh 25, 281.
- McClure, L. K. (2003), *Courtesans at Table: Gender and Greek Literary Culture in Athenaeus*, New York.
- Meesters, R. (forthcoming), 'The Visual Representation of the Formulaic Colophon Verse τῷ συντελεστῇ τῶν καλῶν θεῷ χάρις', in Brockmann, C., Deckers, D., Harlfinger, D., and Valente, S. (eds), *Griechisch-byzantinische Handschriftenforschung: Traditionen, Entwicklungen, neue Wege*, Berlin.
- Meimaris, I. E. and Makrygianni, N. S. (2008), *Ἔρνος κύδιμον Παλαιστίνης γαίης: Ἀνθολογία ἐλληνικῶν ἐπιγραφῶν Παλαιστίνης καὶ Ἀραβίας*, Athens.
- Meister, K. (2000), 'Philochoros', in Cancik, H. and Schneider, H. (eds), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, vol. 9, Stuttgart, 821–2.
- Meliadò, C. (2005), 'Posidippo, l'epos ellenistico e la propaganda tolemaica', in Di Marco, M., Palumbo Stracca, B. M., and Lelli, E. (eds), *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario: Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004* (= *Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6), Pisa, 203–16.
- Merkelbach, R. and Stauber, J. (eds) (2005), *Jenseits des Euphrat: Griechische Inschriften: Ein epigraphisches Lesebuch*, Munich.
- Meyer, D. (1993), 'Die Einbeziehung des Lesers in den Epigrammen des Kallimachos', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Callimachus* (Hellenistica Groningana 1), Groningen, 161–75.
- Meyer, D. (1995), *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen: Die Rezeption des Steinepigramms bei Kallimachos*, Diss., Freiburg.
- Meyer, D. (2005), *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen: Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos* (Hermes Einzelschriften 93), Stuttgart.
- Meyer, D. (2007), 'The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 187–210.

- Meyer, D. and Urlacher-Becht, C. (eds) (2017), *La Rhétorique du 'petit' dans l'épigramme grecque et latine: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (26–27 mai 2015)*, Paris.
- Miall, D. S. (2003), 'Literary Discourse', in Graesser, A. C., Gernsbacher, M. A., and Goldman, S. R. (eds), *Handbook of Discourse Processes*, Mahwah, NJ, 321–55.
- Miall, D. S. and Kuiken, D. (1999), 'What Is Literariness? Three Components of Literary Reading', *Discourse Processes* 28, 121–38.
- Miall, D. S. and Kuiken, D. (2002), 'A Feeling for Fiction: Becoming What We Behold', *Poetics* 30, 221–41.
- Miguélez Caverio, L. (2008), *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200–600 AD* [sic] (Sozomena: Studies in the Recovery of Ancient Texts 2), Berlin.
- Miller, A. M. (1986), *From Delos to Delphi: A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 93), Leiden.
- Milovanović, Č. (ed.) (1986), *Βυζαντινὰ αἰνύγματα: Vizantijske zagonetke*, Belgrade.
- Milovanović-Barham, Č. (1993), 'Aldhelm's *Enigmata* and Byzantine Riddles', *ASE* 22, 51–64.
- Mitchell, A. G. (2009), *Greek Vase-Painting and the Origins of Visual Humour*, Cambridge.
- Mitford, T. B. (1991), 'Inscriptiones Ponticae: Sebastopolis', *ZPE* 87, 181–243.
- Monaco, G. (ed.) (1968), *Cicerone: L'exkursus de ridiculis (de or. II 216–290)* (Hermes: Collana di Testi Antichi 1), 2nd edn, Palermo.
- Monaco, G. (ed.) (1970 [1967]), *Quintiliano: Il capitolo de risu (inst. or. VI 3)* (Hermes: Collana di Testi Antichi 2), Palermo.
- Mondrain, B. (2000), 'Jean Argyropoulos professeur à Constantinople et ses auditeurs médecins, d'Andronic Éparque à Démétrios Angelos', in Scholz, C. and Makris, G. (eds), *Πολύπλευρος νοῦς: Miscellanea für Peter Schreiner zu seinem 60. Geburtstag* (foreword by H. Hunger; Byzantinisches Archiv 19), Munich, 223–50.
- Money, D. (2015), 'Epigram and Occasional Poetry', in Knight, S. and Tilg, S. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*, Oxford, 73–86.
- Morelli, A. M. (ed.) (2008), *Epigramma longum: Da Marziale alla tarda antichità/ From Martial to Late Antiquity: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 29–31 maggio 2006*, 2 vols (Collana Scientifica 21), Cassino.
- Morelli, A. M. (2015), 'Il papiro di Nicarco (P.Oxy. LXVI 4502) e l'epigramma latino', in Del Corso, L., De Vivo, F., and Stramaglia, A. (eds), *Nel segno del testo: Edizioni, materiali e studi per Oronzo Pecere* (Papyrologica Florentina 44), Florence, 41–60.
- Moreno, P. (1999), *Sabato in museo: Letture di arte ellenistica e romana* (Archaeologia e Arte Antica 5), Milan.
- Moretti, L. (ed.) (1967), *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche*, vol. 1: *Attica, Peloponneso, Beozia* (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori 53), Florence.
- Moretti, L. (ed.) (1976), *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche*, vol. 2: *Grecia centrale e settentrionale* (Biblioteca di studi superiori 62), Florence.
- Morisi, L. (ed.) (1999), *Gaio Valerio Catullo: Attis (Carmen LXIII)* (Testi e Manuali per l'Insegnamento Universitario del Latino 62), Bologna.
- Mossay, J. (2009), 'Antiquité classique et tradition biblique en symbiose dans l'*Anthologie Palatine*, VIII, Épigrammes 12–23', *Res Antiquae* 6, 147–52.
- Most, G. W. (2013), 'Eros in Hesiod', in Sanders, E., Thumiger, C., Carey, C., and Lowe, N. J. (eds), *Erös in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 163–74.

- Motti, G. (2004), 'Un proemio ovidiano e la presenza di Meleagro: *Rem. am.*, 25–6', in Valvo, A. and Manzoni, G. (eds), *Analecta brixiana*, vol. 1: *Contributi dell'Istituto di Filologia e storia dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore*, Milan, 303–13.
- Müller, K. (ed.) (1935), *Die Epigramme des Antiphrilos von Byzanz* (Neue Deutsche Forschungen: Abteilung Klassische Philologie 2), Berlin.
- Nagy, G. (1979), *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Baltimore, MD.
- Nagy, G. (1990), *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*, Baltimore, MD.
- Nagy, G. (1992 [1990]), 'Phaethon, Sappho's Phaon, and the White Rock of Leukas: "Reading" the Symbols of Greek Lyric', in Nagy, G., *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Myth and Poetics), Ithaca, NY, 223–62.
- Napoli, A. (2015), 'Cinque uomini su dieci navi (per non parlar dei giudici): Un enigma in Athen. 10, 457b–c', *QUCC* 111, 163–73.
- Nastos, I. S. (ed.) (2006), *Ασκληπιάδου του Σάμιου: Επιγράμματα*, Heraklion.
- Nauta, R. R. and Harder, A. (eds) (2005), *Catullus' Poem on Attis: Text and Contexts*, Leiden.
- Newman, J. K. (1990), *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility*, Hildesheim.
- Nietzsche, F. (1870), 'Laertius Diogenes als Epigrammendichter', in Nietzsche, F., *Gratulationsschrift des Paedagogiums zu Basel: Inhalt: Beiträge zur Quellenkunde und Kritik des Laertius Diogenes*, Basel, 1–7.
- Nisbet, G. (2003), *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire: Martial's Forgotten Rivals*, Oxford.
- Nisbet, G. (2013), *Greek Epigram in Reception: J. A. Symonds, Oscar Wilde, and the Invention of Desire, 1805–1929*, Oxford.
- Nisetich, F. (trans.) (2001), *The Poems of Callimachus*, Oxford.
- Nisetich, F. (trans.) (2005), 'The Poems of Posidippus', in Gutzwiller, K. J. (ed.), *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, 17–64.
- Nocchi, F. R. (ed.) (2016), *Commento agli 'Epigrammata bobiensia'* (Texte und Kommentare 54), Berlin.
- Nock, A. D. (1972), *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 2 vols, Oxford.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1994), *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (Martin Classical Lectures New Series 2), Princeton, NJ.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2001), *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*, Cambridge.
- Nystrom, B. P. (ed.) (2004), *An English Translation of the Poetry of Lucillius, A First-Century Greek Epigrammatist* (Studies in Classics), Lewiston, NY.
- Offermann, H. (1978), 'Goldregen über Nikeratos' Haus (zu Menander Samia 589 ff.)', *Philologus* 122, 150–3.
- Ohlert, K. (1912 [1886]), *Rätsel und Rätselspiele der alten Griechen*, Berlin. Title of 1st edn *Rätsel und Gesellschaftsspiele der alten Griechen*.
- Olivieri, A. (ed.) (1949), *Epigrammatisti greci della Magna Grecia e della Sicilia* (Collana di studi greci 18), Naples.
- Olson, S. D. (ed., trans.) (2011), *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters, Books 13.594b–14*, vol. 7 (Loeb Classical Library 345), Cambridge, MA.
- Orsini, P. (2000), 'Lo scriba J dell'Antologia Palatina e Costantino Rodio', *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 54, 425–35.

- Ouvré, H. (1894), *Méléagre de Gadara*, Diss., Paris.
- Owen, G. E. L. (1983), 'Philosophical Invective', *OSAPh* 1, 1–25. Repr. in Nussbaum, M. (ed.) (1986), *Logic, Science, and Dialectic: Collected Papers in Greek Philosophy*, G. E. L. Owen, Ithaca, NY, 347–64.
- Pachis, P. (1996), "Γαλλαίων Κυβέλης δόλονγμα" (*Anthol. Palat.* VI, 173): L'Élément orgiastique dans le culte de Cybèle', in Lane, E. N. (ed.), *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults: Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaseren* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 131), Leiden, 193–222.
- Page, D. L. (ed.) (1978), *The Epigrams of Rufinus* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 21), Cambridge.
- Page, D. L. (ed.) (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams: Epigrams before AD 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources, Not Included in Hellenistic Epigrams or The Garland of Philip*, Cambridge.
- Pagonare-Antoniou, P. (ed.) (1997), *Καλλιμάχου Επιγράμματα*, Athens.
- Paige, D. D. (ed.) (1951), *The Letters of Ezra Pound, 1907–1941*, London.
- Papaioannou, S. (2003), 'Founder, Civilizer and Leader: Vergil's Evander and his Role in the Origins of Rome', *Mnemosyne* 56, 680–702.
- Papaioannou, S. (2014), 'Terence's Literary Self-Consciousness and the Anxiety of Menander's Influence', in Papaioannou, S. (ed.), *Terence and Interpretation*, (Pierides: Studies in Greek and Latin Literature 4), Newcastle, 95–118.
- Pappadakis, N. G. (1920–1), 'Β' Αρχαιολογική Περιφέρεια: Περισυλλογή αρχαίων: Τυχαία εύρηματα: Άλλη έρευνα τής περιφέρειας', *Archaiologikon Deltion* 6, 139–53.
- Parker, R. (1996), *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford.
- Parsons, P. J. (1999), '4502: Epigrams (Nicarchus II)', in Gonis, N. et al. (eds), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 66 (Egypt Exploration Society), London, 43–57.
- Parsons, P. J. (2002), 'Callimachus and the Hellenistic Epigram', in Montanari, F. et al. (eds), *Callimache* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 48), Vandoeuvres Geneva, 99–136.
- Parsons, P. J., Maehler, H., and Maltomini, F. (eds) (2015), *The Vienna Epigrams Papyrus* (G 40611) (Corpus Papyrorum Raineri 33), Berlin.
- Passow, F. (1827), *Quaestio de vestigiis Coronarum Meleagri et Philippi in anthologia Constantini Cephalae*, Breslau.
- Paton, W. R. (ed., trans.) (1916–18), *The Greek Anthology*, 5 vols (Loeb Classical Library 67, 68, 84–6), London.
- Pavlovskis, Z. (1988), 'The Riddler's Microcosm: From Symphosius to St. Boniface', *C&M* 39, 219–51.
- Peek, W. (1932), 'Zu griechischen Epigrammen', *Philologus* 87, 229–41.
- Peek, W. (1949), 'Palladas', *RE* 18.3, 158–68.
- Peek, W. (ed.) (1955), *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, vol. 1: *Grab-Epigramme*, Berlin.
- Peek, W. (1957), 'Antipater von Sidon und Antisthenes von Paphos', *Philologus* 101, 101–12 (plate following).
- Peek, W. (ed.) (1960), *Griechische Grabgedichte* (Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt 7), Berlin.
- Peek, W. (1973), 'Ein Weihgedicht des Theodoridas', *Philologus* 117, 66–9.
- Pelliccio, F. (2013), *Gli epigrammi di Apollonide: Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Diss., Naples.

- Pelliccio, F. (2014), 'Rappresentazione dei dedicatari e auto-rappresentazione dei poeti negli epigrammi greci d'età romana', in Grisolia, R. and Matino, G. (eds), *Arte della parola e parole della scienza: Tecniche della comunicazione letteraria nel mondo antico* (Collectanea 33), Naples, 175–92.
- Pelliccio, F. (2017), 'Alla ricerca della brevità: L' ὀλιγοστιχίη nella Corona di Filippo', in Meyer, D. and Urlacher-Becht, C. (eds), *La Rhétorique du 'petit' dans l'épigramme grecque et latine: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (26–27 mai 2015)*, Paris, 101–12.
- Pepper, T. W. (2010), 'A Patron and a Companion: Two Animal Epitaphs for Zenon of Caunos (P. Cair. Zen. IV 59532 = SH 977)', in Gagos, T. and Hyatt, A. (eds), *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor, July 29–August 4, 2007* (American Studies in Papyrology), Ann Arbor, MI, 605–22.
- Perec, G. (1969), *La Disparition*, Paris.
- Pernigotti, C. and Maltomini, F. (2002), 'Morfologie ed impieghi delle raccolte simposiali: Lineamenti di storia di una tipologia libraria antica', *MD* 49, 53–84.
- Peters, O. I. (1923), *Asklepiades von Samos*, Diss., Leipzig.
- Petrovic, A. (2007a), 'Inscribed Epigram in Pre-Hellenistic Literary Sources', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds) *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 49–68.
- Petrovic, A. (ed.) (2007b), *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 282), Leiden.
- Petrovic, A. (2009), 'Epigrammatic Contests, *Poeti Vaganti* and Local History', in Hunter, R. L. and Rutherford, I. (eds), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, Cambridge, 195–216.
- Petrovic, A. (2013), 'Inscribed Epigrams in Orators and Epigrammatic Collections', in Liddel, P. and Low, P. (eds), *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents), Oxford, 197–213.
- Petrovic, A. (2015), 'Epitymbia 42–50', in Seidensticker, B., Stähli, A., and Wessels, A. (eds), *Der neue Poseidipp: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Texte zur Forschung 108), Darmstadt, 186–211.
- Petrovic, I. (2014), 'Posidippus and Achaemenid Royal Propaganda', in Hunter, R. L., Rengakos, A., and Sistakou, E. (eds), *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 25), Berlin, 273–300.
- Petrovic, I. (2017), 'The Cult of Homer in Alexandria and Epigram SH 979', in Durbec, Y. and Trajber, F. (eds), *Traditions épiques et poésie épigrammatique: Actes du colloque des 7, 8 et 9 novembre 2012 à Aix-en-Provence* (Hellenistica Groningana 22), Leuven, 115–20.
- Pfeiffer, R. (ed.) (1949–53), *Callimachus*, vol. 1: *Fragmenta*, vol. 2: *Hymni et epigrammata*, Oxford.
- Piacenza, N. (1998), 'L'immortalità negata: Osservazioni sull'epigramma VII 170 dell' *Antologia Palatina*', *AevumAnt* 11, 345–50.
- Piacenza, N. (2010), 'Callimaco, Leonida di Taranto e la poetica dell' ὀλίγος: Spunti per un confronto e per una rilettura di AP 6,300 e 302', *Appunti Romani di Filologia* 12, 79–92.
- Pitts, A. (2018), 'Paulus Silentiarius and the Age of Gold'. Unpublished ms.
- Plantin, C. and Traverso, V. (2000), 'Présentation', in Plantin, C., Doury, M., and Traverso, V. (eds), *Les Émotions dans les interactions* (Éthologie et Psychologie des Communications), Lyon, 7–14.

- Platt, V. (2002), 'Evasive Epiphanies in Ekphrastic Epigram', *Ramus* 31, 33–50.
- Polemis, I. (2013), 'Σαπφώ καὶ Παλλαδᾶς: Σημειώσεις σὲ ἓνα ἐπίγραμμα', *Παρεκβολαί/ Parekbolai: An Electronic Journal for Byzantine Literature* 3, 1–4.
- Pollitt, J. J. (1986), *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge.
- Pontani, F. M. (1982), 'Lo scoliaste e Cometa', in *Studi in onore di Aristide Colonna* (Università degli studi di Perugia, Istituto di filologia classica), Perugia, 247–53.
- Pordomingo, F. (1994), 'Sur les premières anthologies d'épigrammes sur papyrus', in Bülow-Jacobsen, A. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists, Copenhagen, 23–29 August, 1992*, Copenhagen, 326–31.
- Pordomingo, F. (2013), *Antologías de época helenística en papiro* (Papyrologica Florentina 43), Florence.
- Post, R. (2009), 'Mercenary Archers: Cretan Bowmen in the Hellenistic Era', *Ancient Warfare* 3.1, 23–8.
- Post, R. (forthcoming), 'The Bithynian Army in the Hellenistic Period'.
- Preisendanz, K. (ed.) (1911), *Anthologia palatina: Codex Palatinus et Codex Parisinus phototypice editi*, 2 vols (Codices Graeci et Latini Photographice Depicti 15), Leiden.
- Preisendanz, K. and Henrichs, A. (eds) (1973–4 [1928–31, 1941]), *Papyri graecae magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, Stuttgart.
- Prêtre, C. (2012), *Kosmos et kosmema: Les Offrandes de parure dans les inscriptions de Délos* (Kernos Suppl. 27), Liège.
- Prioux, É. (2007), *Regards alexandrins: Histoire et théorie des arts dans l'épigramme hellénistique* (Hellenistica Groningana 12), Leuven.
- Prioux, É. (2008), *Petits musées en vers: Épigramme et discours sur les collections antiques* (L'Art et l'Essai 5), Paris.
- Prioux, É. (2011), 'Emotions in Ecphrasis and Art Criticism', in Munteanu LaCourse, D. (ed.), *Emotion, Genre and Gender in Classical Antiquity*, London, 135–74.
- Purola, T. (1994), 'P. Cairo Zenon 4.59532: Two Epitaphs for a Hunting Dog Called Tauron', *Arctos* 28, 55–62.
- Race, W. H. (1982), *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 74), Leiden.
- Race, W. H. (1988), *Classical Genres and English Poetry*, London.
- Race, W. H. (ed., trans.) (2009), *Apollonius Rhodius: Argonautica* (Loeb Classical Library 1), Cambridge, MA.
- Radinger, C. (1895), *Meleagros von Gadara: Eine litterargeschichtliche Skizze*, Innsbruck. Repr. in Tarán, S. L. (ed.) (1987), *The Greek Anthology* (Ancient Greek Literature), New York, vol. 2, 1–115.
- Raimondi, V. (2005), 'Αἰπολικὸς δυσέρως in Posidippo 19 A.–B.: Un richiamo al Ciclope innamorato infelice di Theocr. *Idd.* 6 e 11', in Di Marco, M., Palumbo Stracca, B. M., and Lelli, E. (eds), *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario: Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma 14–15 maggio 2004* (= *Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6), Pisa, 133–46.
- Rapp, Christoph (ed.) (2002), *Aristoteles: Rhetorik*, 2 vols (Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung 4), Berlin.
- Rapp, Christoph (2005), 'Pathos / Widerfahrnis, Affekt', in Höffe, O. (ed.), *Aristoteles-Lexikon* (Kröners Taschenausgabe 459), Stuttgart, 427–36.

- Rapp, Claudia (2005), 'Literary Culture under Justinian', in Maas, M. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge, 376–97.
- Rasche, W. (1910), *De Anthologiae graecae epigrammatis quae colloquii formam habent*, Diss., Münster.
- Raubitschek, A. E. (1968), 'Das Denkmal-Epigramm', in Raubitschek, A. E. et al. (eds.), *L'Épigramme grecque* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 14), Vandoeuvres Geneva, 1–36.
- Reinach, T. (1890), *De Archia poeta*, Diss., Paris.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1893), *Epigramm und Skolion: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*, Giessen.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1907), 'Epigramm', *RE* VI.1, 71–111.
- Richardson, N. J. (ed.) (1974), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford.
- Richardson, N. J. (ed.) (1993), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 6: *Books 21–24* (gen. ed. G. S. Kirk), Cambridge.
- Rizzolatti, G. and Sinigaglia, C. (2008 [2006]), *Mirrors in the Brain: How Our Minds Share Actions and Emotions*, trans. by F. Anderson, Oxford.
- Robert, L. (ed.) (1949), *Hellenica: Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, vol. 7, Paris.
- Robert, L. (1960), 'L'Épigramme Dussaud', *Hellenica* 11–12, 323–5.
- Robert, L. (1966), 'Sur un décret d'Ilion et sur un papyrus concernant des cultes royaux', in Samuel, A. E. (ed.), *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles* (American Studies in Papyrology 1), New Haven, CT, 175–212. Repr. in Robert, L. (1990), *Opera minora selecta*, vol. 7: *Épigraphie et antiquités grecques*, Amsterdam, 599–635.
- Robert, L. (1968), 'Dans l'amphithéâtre et dans les jardins de Néron: Une épigramme de Lucilius', *CRAI*, 280–8.
- Rocheftort, G. (1950), 'Une anthologie grecque du XI^e siècle: Le *Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 690*', *Scriptorium* 4, 3–17.
- Roller, L. E. (1999), *In Search of God the Mother: The Cult of Anatolian Cybele*, Berkeley, CA.
- Romero, J. M. (1999), *The Ethics of Genres: Towards a Rhetoric of Apology in Vergilian Bucolic Discourse*, Diss., Durham, NC.
- Rosen, R. M. (2007), 'The Hellenistic Epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 459–76.
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. (1992), *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. (2002), 'Epistolary Epigrams in the Greek Anthology', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Hellenistica Groningana 6), Leuven, 137–49.
- Rossi, E. (1956), 'La leggenda di Turandot', in *Studi orientalistici in onore di Giorgio Levi Della Vida* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto per l'Oriente 52), Rome, vol. 2, 457–76.
- Rossi, L. E. (1971), 'I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche', *BICS* 18, 69–94.
- Rossi, L. (ed.) (2001), *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach* (Hellenistica Groningana 5), Leuven.

- Rossi, L. (2002), 'Composition and Reception in AP 9.1–583: *Aphegheseis, Epideixeis and Progymnasmata*', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Hellenistica Groningana 6), Leuven, 151–74.
- Rotstein, A. (2010), *The Idea of Iambos*, Oxford.
- Rougemont, G. (2001 [1998]), 'Un poème grec inédit trouvé à Suse', in *Alexander's Legacy in the East: Studies in Honor of Paul Bernard* (Bulletin of the Asia Institute 12), Bloomfield Hills, MI, 227–30.
- Rouse, W. H. D. (ed., trans.) (1940), *Nonnos: Dionysiaca*, vol. 2: *Books 16–35* (Loeb Classical Library 354), Cambridge, MA.
- Rowe, C. J. (ed.) (1993), *Plato: Phaedo* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), Cambridge.
- Roy, J. (2009), 'Anyte of Tegea and the Other Dead', in Cavanagh, H., Cavanagh, W., and Roy, J. (eds), *Honouring the Dead in the Peloponnese: Proceedings of the Conference held at Sparta, 23–25 April 2009*, Nottingham, 643–56.
- Rozema, B. J. (1971), *Lucilius the Epigrammatist: Text and Commentary*, Diss., Wisconsin.
- Rubensohn, M. (ed.) (1888), *Crinagorae Mytilenaei epigrammata*, Berlin.
- Runia, D. T. (1986), 'Theocritus of Chios' Epigram against Aristotle', *CQ* 36, 531–4.
- Russell, D. A. (ed., trans.) (2002), *Quintilian: The Orator's Education: Books 9–10* (Loeb Classical Library 127), Cambridge, MA.
- Samuel, A. E. (1993), 'The Ptolemies and the Ideology of Kingship' (with a response by D. Delia and discussion), in Green, P. (ed.), *Hellenistic History and Culture* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 9), Berkeley, CA, 168–210.
- Sánchez Ortiz de Landaluce, M. (2006), 'El motivo de Ganimedes en el epigrama griego posthelenístico: Addenda a S. L. Tarán, *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*', *Eikasmos* 17, 215–42.
- Sander, D. and Scherer, K. R. (eds) (2009), *The Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences*, Oxford.
- Santin, E. (2009), *Autori di epigrammi sepolcrali greci su pietra: Firme di poeti occasionali e professionisti* (NSA Memorie 9.24), Rome.
- Santin, E. and Foschia, L. (eds) (2016), *L'Épigramme dans tous ses états: Épigraphiques, littéraires, historiques*, Lyon.
- Santin, E. and Tziafalias, A. (2013), 'Épigrammes signées de Thessalie', *Topoi* 18, 251–82.
- Schatzmann, A. (ed.) (2012), *Nikarchos II: Epigrammata: Einleitung, Texte, Kommentar* (Hypomnemata 188), Göttingen.
- Scheid, J. (2013), *Les Dieux, l'état et l'individu: Réflexions sur la religion civique à Rome* (Les Livres du Nouveau Monde), Paris.
- Scheid-Tissinier, É. (2012), 'Du bon usage des émotions dans la culture grecque', in Payen, P. and Scheid-Tissinier, É. (eds), *Anthropologie de l'antiquité: Anciens objets, nouvelles approches* (Antiquité et Sciences Humaines 1), Turnhout, 263–90.
- Schmitt, A. (2008), 'Die Intelligenz der Gefühle und ihre Kultivierung durch Literatur bei Aristoteles', in Bormann, D. and Wittchow, F. (eds), *Emotionalität in der Antike: Zwischen Performativität und Diskursivität: Festschrift für Johannes Christes dargestellt von Freunden und Kollegen* (Körper, Zeichen, Kultur 23), Berlin, 249–63.
- Schmitt, A. (ed.) (2011 [2008]), *Aristoteles: Poetik* (Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung 5), rev. edn, Berlin.

- Schmitz, T. A. (2010a), 'Epigrammatic Communication in Callimachus' *Epigrams*', *GRBS* 50, 370–90.
- Schmitz, T. A. (2010b), 'Speaker and Addressee in Early Greek Epigram and Lyric', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 25–41.
- Scholl, R. (ed.) (1990), *Corpus der ptolemäischen Sklaventexte*, 3 vols (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei 1), Stuttgart.
- Schott, P. (1905), *Posidippi epigrammata collecta et illustrata*, Diss., Berlin.
- Schouler, B. (2006), 'Le Retour de Miltiade', in Amato, E., in collaboration with Roduit, A. and Steinrück, M. (eds), *Approches de la Troisième Sophistique: Hommages à Jacques Schamp* (Collection Latomus 296), Brussels, 339–59.
- Schrier, O. J. (1979), 'Love with Doris: Dioscorides, *Anth. Pal.* V 55 (= 1483–1490 Gow–Page)', *Mnemosyne* 32, 307–26.
- Schrier, O. J. (1982), 'Doris' Love Again', *Mnemosyne* 35, 146–8.
- Schulte, H. (ed.) (1990), *Julian von Ägypten* (BAC 3), Trier.
- Schulte, H. (ed.) (1999), *Die Epigramme des Nikarchos* (BAC 43), Trier.
- Schulte, H. (ed.) (2004), *Die Epigramme des Ammianos* (BAC 59), Trier.
- Schulte, H. (ed.) (2005), *Die Epigramme des Leontios Scholastikos Minotauros* (BAC 62), Trier.
- Schulte, H. (ed.) (2006), *Paralipomena Cycli: Epigramme aus der Sammlung des Agathias* (BAC 73), Trier.
- Schultz, W. (1909), *Rätsel aus dem hellenischen Kulturkreise*, vol. 1: *Die Rätselüberlieferung*, vol. 2: *Erläuterungen zur Rätselüberlieferung* (Mythologische Bibliothek 3.1 and 5.1), Leipzig. 2nd edn 1912.
- Schultz, W. (1914), 'Rätsel', in *RE* 1 A1, Stuttgart, 62–125.
- Seelbach, W. (ed.) (1964), *Die Epigramme des Mnasalkes von Sikyon und des Theodoridas von Syrakus* (Klassisch-philologische Studien 28), Wiesbaden.
- Seidensticker, B., Stähli, A., and Wessels, A. (2015a), 'Einleitung', in Seidensticker, B., Stähli, A., and Wessels, A. (eds), *Der neue Poseidipp: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Texte zur Forschung 108), Darmstadt, 9–17.
- Seidensticker, B., Stähli, A., and Wessels, A. (eds) (2015b), *Der neue Poseidipp: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Texte zur Forschung 108), Darmstadt.
- Sens, A. (2002), 'An Ecphrastic Pair: Asclepiades AP 12.75 and Asclepiades or Posidippus *AP* 68', *CJ* 97, 249–62.
- Sens, A. (2007), 'One Thing Leads (Back) to Another: Allusion and the Invention of Tradition in Hellenistic Epigrams', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 373–90.
- Sens, A. (ed.) (2011), *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments*, Oxford.
- Setti, G. (ed.) (1890), *Studi sulla antologia greca: Gli epigrammi degli Antipatri*, Turin.
- Setti, G. (1892), *Gli epigrammi di Luciano*, Turin. From *Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione Classica* 20.4–6, 233–76.
- Seyrig, H. (1954), 'Épigramme funéraire du Hauran (?)', in 'Antiquités syriennes', *Syria* 31, 214–17.
- Sfameni Gasparro, G. (1978), 'Connotazioni metroache di Demetra nel Coro dell'Elena (vv. 1301–1365)', in de Boer, M. B. and Edridge, T. A. (eds), *Hommages à*

- Maarten J. Vermaseren: *Recueil d'études offert par les auteurs de la série Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain à Maarten J. Vermaseren à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire le 7 avril 1978*, 3 vols (Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain 68), Leiden, vol. 3, 1148–87.
- Sfameni Gasparro, G. (1985), *Soteriology and Mystic Aspects in the Cult of Cybele and Attis* (Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain 103), Leiden.
- Sharrock, A. and Morales, H. (eds) (2000), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, Oxford.
- Sider, D. (ed.) (1997), *The Epigrams of Philodemos*, Oxford.
- Sider, D. (2007), 'Sylloge Simonidea', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 113–30.
- Sinko, T. (1905), 'De Callimachi epigr. XXIII. W.', *Eos* 11, 1–10.
- Sistakou, E. (2014), 'From Emotion to Sensation: The Discovery of the Senses in Hellenistic Poetry', in Hunter, R. L., Rengakos, A., and Sistakou, E. (eds), *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 25), Berlin, 135–56.
- Sistakou, E. and Rengakos, A. (eds) (2016), *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 43), Berlin.
- Small, S. G. P. (1951), 'Marcus Argentarius: A Poet of the *Greek Anthology*', *YCIS* 12, 65–145.
- Smith, R. R. R. (1991), *Hellenistic Sculpture: A Handbook* (World of Art Library), London.
- Smutny, R. J. (1955), *The Text History of the Epigrams of Theocritus* (University of California Publications in Classical Philology 15), Berkeley, CA.
- Snyder, J. M. (1989), *The Woman and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome*, Bristol.
- Solitario, M. (2015), *Leonidas of Tarentum: Between Cynical Polemic and Poetic Refinement* (Quaderni dei Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca 19), Rome.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1983), 'A Trauma in Flux: Death in the Eighth Century and After', in Hägg, R. (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century BC: Tradition and Innovation: Proceedings of the Second International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 1–5 June, 1981*, Stockholm, 33–49.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1995), *'Reading' Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*, Oxford.
- Spawforth, A. (1994), 'Symbol of Unity? The Persian-Wars Tradition in the Roman Empire', in Hornblower, S. (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford, 233–47.
- Spier, J. (2001), *A Catalogue of the Calouste Gulbenkian Collection of Gems*, Lisbon.
- Squire, M. (2009), *Image and Text in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Squire, M. (2010a), 'Introduction: The Art of Art History in Greco-Roman Antiquity', in Platt, V. and Squire, M. (eds), *The Art of Art History in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (= *Arethusa* 43.2), Baltimore, MD, 133–63.
- Squire, M. (2010b), 'Making Myron's Cow Moo? Ecphrastic Epigram and the Poetics of Simulation', *AJPh* 131, 589–634.

- Squire, M. (2010c), 'Reading a View: Poem and Picture in the Greek Anthology', *Ramus* 39, 73–103.
- Stanzel, K.-H. (2007), 'Bucolic Epigram', in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies), Leiden, 333–51.
- Stefec, R. (2011), 'Anmerkungen zu weiteren Epigrammen in epigraphischer Auszeichnungsmajuskel', *Byzantion* 81, 326–61.
- Steinbichler, W. (1998), *Die Epigramme des Dichters Straton von Sardes: Ein Beitrag zum griechischen pädagogischen Epigramm* (Europäische Hochschulschriften 15, Klassische Sprachen und Literaturen 74), Frankfurt.
- Stephens, S. A. (2004), 'For you, Arsinoe...', in Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M. (eds), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309) (Hellenic Studies 2), Washington, DC, 161–76.
- Stephens, S. A. (2005), 'Battle of the Books', in Gutzwiller, K. J. (ed.), *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, 229–48.
- Stewart, P. (1999), 'The Destruction of Statues in Late Antiquity', in Miles, R. (ed.), *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*, London, 159–89.
- Stichel, R. H. W. (1999), 'Fortuna Redux, Pompeius und die Goten: Bemerkungen zu einem wenig beachteten Säulenmonument Konstantinopels', *MDAI(I)* 49, 467–92.
- Storey, I. C. (1989), 'The "Blameless Shield" of Kleonymos', *RhM* 132, 247–61.
- Stramaglia, A. (1996), 'Fra "consumo" e "impegno": Usi didattici della narrativa nel mondo antico', in Pecere, O. and Stramaglia, A. (eds), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo Greco-latino: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 14–17 settembre 1994*, Cassino, 97–166.
- Stramaglia, A. (2003), 'Amori impossibili: PKöln 250, le raccolte proginnasmatiche e la tradizione retorica dell' "amante di un ritratto" [tavole 1–5]', in Schröder, B.-J. and Schröder, J.-P. (eds), *Studium declamatorium: Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 176), Munich, 213–39.
- Straus, J. A. (2004), *L'Achat et la vente des esclaves dans l'Égypte romaine: Contribution papyrologique à l'étude de l'esclavage dans une province orientale de l'empire romain* (Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete 14), Munich.
- Stroebe, M. S. and Stroebe, W. (2009), 'Grief', in Sander, D. and Scherer, K. R. (eds), *The Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences*, Oxford, 198–9.
- Sullivan, J. P. (1991), *Martial: The Unexpected Classic: A Literary and Historical Study*, Cambridge.
- Summers, K. (1996), 'Lucretius' Roman Cybele', in Lane, E. N. (ed.), *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults: Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaseren* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 131), Leiden, 337–65.
- Suter, A. (ed.) (2009), 'Tragic Tears and Gender', in Fögen, T. (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World*, Berlin, 59–84.
- Svenbro, J. (1988), *Phrasikleia: Anthropologie de la lecture en Grèce ancienne*, Paris.
- Svenbro, J. (1993 [1988]), *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. by J. Lloyd (Myth and Poetics), Ithaca, NY.

- Taillardat, J. (1989), 'L'Építaphe burlesque de Cleitorios', in Étienne, R., Le Dinahet, M.-T., and Yon, M. (eds), *Architecture et poésie dans le monde grec: Hommage à Georges Roux* (Collection de la Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen 19: Série archéologique 10), Lyon, 205–9.
- Tarán, S. L. (1979), *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 9), Leiden.
- Taylor, P. M. (2003 [1990]), *Munitions of the Mind: A History of Propaganda from the Ancient World to the Present Day*, Manchester.
- Theodoropoulou, M. (2012), 'The Emotion Seeks to Be Expressed: Thoughts from a Linguist's Point of View', in Chaniotis, A. (ed.), *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World* (HABES 52), Stuttgart, 433–68.
- Thompson, D. J. (1987), 'Ptolemaios and the "Lighthouse": Greek Culture in the Memphite Serapeum', *PCPhS* 33, 105–21.
- Thompson, D. W. (1947), *A Glossary of Greek Fishes* (St Andrews University Publications 45), London.
- Thonemann, P. (2014), 'Poets of the Axylon', *Chiron* 44, 191–232.
- Tissoni, F. (ed.) (2000), *Cristodoro: Un'introduzione e un commento* (Hellenica 6), Alessandria.
- Tissoni, F. (2003), 'Gli epigrammi di Areta', *MEG* 3, 281–306.
- Treu, M. (ed.) (1893), *Eustathii Macrembolitae quae feruntur aenigmata* (Programm des Königlichen Friedrichs-Gymnasiums zu Breslau 128), Breslau.
- Trümper, C. (2010), 'Observations on the Dedicatory and Sepulchral Epigrams, and Their Early History', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 167–80.
- Tsagalis, C. C. (2004), *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 70), Berlin. Repr. 2012.
- Tsagalis, C. C. (2008), *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 1), Berlin.
- Tueller, M. A. (2008), *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram* (Hellenistica Groningana 13), Leuven.
- Tueller, M. A. (2010), 'The Passer-by in Archaic and Classical Epigram', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 42–60.
- Tueller, M. A. (2012), 'Graveside Irony in the *Iliad*', in Bers, V., Elmer, D., Frame, D., and Muellner, L. (eds), *Donum natalicium digitaliter confectum Gregorio Nagy septuagenario a discipulis collegis familiaribus oblatum / A Virtual Birthday Gift Presented to Gregory Nagy on Turning Seventy by his Students, Colleagues, and Friends*, Washington, DC. <https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/4367>.
- Turner, E. G. (1962), '2459: Euripides, *Oedipus*', in Turner, E. G. et al. (eds), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 27 (Egypt Exploration Society), London, 81–6.
- Valerio, F. (2014), *Agazia Scolastico: Epigrammi: Introduzione, testo critico e traduzione*, Diss., Venice.
- Van Noorden, H. (2015), *Playing Hesiod: The 'Myth of the Races' in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge.

- Van Opstall, E. M. (ed.) (2008), *Jean Géomètre: Poèmes en hexamètres et en distiques élégiaques* (The Medieval Mediterranean: Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1500 75), Leiden.
- Vendries, C. (2001), 'Pour les oreilles de Cybèle: Images plurielles de la musique sur les autels tauroboliques de la Gaule romaine', in Brulé, P. and Vendries, C. (eds), *Chanter les dieux: Musique et religion dans l'antiquité grecque et romaine: Actes du colloque des 16, 17 et 18 décembre 1999, Rennes et Lorient* (Histoire), Rennes, 197–218.
- Veniero, A. (1916), *Paolo Silenziario: Studio sulla letteratura bizantina del VI sec.* (Biblioteca di filologia classica 13), Catania.
- Vérilhac, A.-M. (1978), *Παῖδες ἄωροι: Poésie funéraire*, vol. 1 (*Πραγματεῖαι τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν* 41), Athens.
- Vérilhac, A.-M. (1982), *Παῖδες ἄωροι: Poésie funéraire*, vol. 2 (*Πραγματεῖαι τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν* 41), Athens.
- Versnel, H. S. (1990), *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion*, vol. 1: *Ter Unus: Isis, Dionysos, Hermes: Three Studies in Henotheism* (Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 6), Leiden.
- Vertoudakis, V. (ed.) (2011), *Το όγδοο βιβλίο της Παλατινής Ανθολογίας: Μια μελέτη των επιγραμμάτων του Γρηγορίου του Ναζιανζηνού*, Athens.
- Vestheim, G. (2010), 'Voice in Sepulchral Epigrams: Some Remarks on the Use of First and Second Person in Sepulchral Epigrams, and a Comparison with Lyric Poetry', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 61–78.
- Vian, F. (ed.) (1990), *Nonnos de Panopolis: Les Dionysiaques*, vol. 9: *Chants XXV–XXIX*, Paris.
- Viansino, G. (ed.) (1963), *Paolo Silenziario: Epigrammi*, Turin.
- Viansino, G. (ed.) (1967), *Agazia Scolastico: Epigrammi*, Milan.
- Viljamaa, T. (1968), *Studies in Greek Encomiastic Poetry of the Early Byzantine Period* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 42.4), Helsinki.
- Voigt, E.-M. (ed.) (1971), *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta*, Amsterdam.
- Vollenweider, M.-L. (1966), *Die Steinschneidekunst und ihre Künstler in spätrepublikanischer und augusteischer Zeit*, Baden-Baden.
- Wachter, R. (2010), 'The Origin of Epigrams on "Speaking Objects"', in Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 250–60.
- Wade-Gery, H. T. (1933), 'Classical Epigrams and Epitaphs: A Study of the Kimonian Age', *JHS* 53, 71–104.
- Wallace, W. and Wallace, M. (eds) (1941), *Asklepiades von Samos*, Oxford.
- Wallraff, M. and Andrist, P. (2015), 'Paratexts of the Bible: A New Research Project on Greek Textual Transmission', *Early Christianity* 6, 237–43.
- Walsh, G. B. (1990), 'Surprised by Self: Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry', *CPh* 85, 1–21.
- Walsh, G. B. (1991), 'Callimachean Passages: The Rhetoric of Epitaph in Epigram', *Arethusa* 24, 77–105.
- Waltz, P. (ed.) (1906), *De Antipatro Sidonio*, Bordeaux.

- Waltz, P. and Soury, G., in collaboration with Irigoin, J. and Laurens, P. (eds) (1974), *Anthologie grecque*, Part I: *Anthologie Palatine*, vol. 8: *Livre IX: Épigrammes* 359–827, Paris.
- Waltz, P. et al. (eds) (1960 [1941]), *Anthologie grecque*, Part I: *Anthologie Palatine*, vol. 5: *Livre VII: Épigrammes* 364–748, Paris.
- Waltz, P. et al. (eds) (2002 [1938]), *Anthologie grecque*, Part I: *Anthologie Palatine*, vol. 4: *Livre VII: Épigrammes* 1–363, Paris.
- Watson, L. and Watson, P. (eds) (2003), *Martial: Select Epigrams* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), Cambridge.
- Webb, R. (2009), *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, Farnham.
- Weigand, G. (ed.) (1840), *De Antipatris Sidonio et Thessalonicensi poetis epigrammaticis*, Breslau.
- Weigand, G. (1845a), 'De fontibus et ordine Anthologiae Cephalanae', *RhM* 3, 161–78.
- Weigand, G. (1845b), 'De fontibus et ordine Anthologiae Cephalanae, Part II', *RhM* 3, 541–72.
- Weigand, G. (1847), 'Quaestionis de fontibus atque ordine Anthologiae Cephalanae appendix', *RhM* 5, 276–88.
- Weil, M. H. (1879), *Un papyrus inédit: Nouveaux fragments d'Euripide et d'autres poètes grecs* (Monuments Grecs Publiés par l'Association pour l'Encouragement des Études Grecques en France 8), Paris.
- Weinreich, O. (1928), *Studien zu Martial: Literarhistorische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 4), Stuttgart.
- Weisshäupl, R. (1889), *Die Grabgedichte der griechischen Anthologie* (Abhandlungen des Archäologisch-Epigraphischen Seminars der Universität Wien 7), Vienna.
- Repr. in Tarán, S. L. (ed.) (1987), *The Greek Anthology*, vol. 1, New York.
- Weisshäupl, R. (1896), 'Zu den Quellen der Anthologia Palatina', in Tempisky, F. (ed.), *Serta Harteliana*, Vienna, 184–8.
- West, M. L. (ed.) (1966), *Hesiod: Theogony*, Oxford.
- West, M. L. (1969), 'Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature', *HSPH* 73, 113–34.
- West, M. L. (2007), *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*, Oxford.
- Whitby, M. (1985), 'The Occasion of Paul the Silentiary's *Ekphrasis* of S. Sophia', *CQ* 35, 215–28.
- Whitby, M. (1998), 'Defender of the Cross: George of Pisidia on the Emperor Heraclius and his Deputies', in Whitby, M. (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 183), Leiden, 247–73.
- Whitby, M. (2003), 'The Vocabulary of Praise in Verse Celebration of 6th-Century Building Achievements: *AP* 2.398–406, *AP* 9.656, *AP* 1.10 and Paul the Silentiary's *Description of St. Sophia*', in Accorinti, D. and Chuvín, P. (eds), *Des géants à Dionysos: Mélanges de mythologie et de poésie grecques offerts à Francis Vian* (Hellenica 10), Alessandria, 593–606.
- White, H. (1981), 'Theocritus' "Adonis Song"', *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 4, 191–206.
- White, S. A. (1994), 'Callimachus on Plato and Cleombrotus', *TAPhA* 124, 135–61.

- Whitmarsh, T. (2011), 'Greek Poets and Roman Patrons in the Late Republic and Early Empire', in Schmitz, T. A. and Wiater, N. (eds), *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and Their Past in the First Century BCE* (Klassische Philologie), Stuttgart, 197–212. Repr. in Whitmarsh, T. (2013), *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Post-classicism*, Berkeley, CA, 137–53.
- Whitmarsh, T. (2013), *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*, Berkeley, CA.
- Wickkiser, B. L. (2013), 'The *ἱματικὰ* of the Milan Posidippus', *CQ* 63, 623–32.
- Wiedemann, T. (1992), *Emperors and Gladiators*, London.
- Wifstrand, A. (1926), *Studien zur griechischen Anthologie* (Acta Universitatis Lundensis 23), Diss., Lund. Repr. in Tarán, S. L. (ed.) (1987), *The Greek Anthology*, vol. 1, New York.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1879), 'Die Galliamben des Kallimachos und Catullus', *Hermes* 14, 194–201. Repr. in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1941), *Kleine Schriften: Hellenistische, spätgriechische und lateinische Poesie*, Berlin, vol. 2, 1–8.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1897 [1882]), *Callimachi Hymni et epigrammata*, Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1924), *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, 2 vols, Berlin.
- Wilkinson, K. W. (2009), 'Palladas and the Age of Constantine', *JRS* 99, 36–60.
- Wilkinson, K. W. (2010a), 'Palladas and the Foundation of Constantinople', *JRS* 100, 179–94.
- Wilkinson, K. W. (2010b), 'Some Neologisms in the Epigrams of Palladas', *GRBS* 50, 295–308.
- Wilkinson, K. W. (ed.) (2012), *New Epigrams of Palladas: A Fragmentary Papyrus Codex (P. CtYBR inv. 4000)* (American Studies in Papyrology 52), Durham, NC.
- Wilkinson, K. W. (2017), Review of Cameron, A. (2016), *Wandering Poets and Other Essays on Late Greek Literature and Philosophy*, *Journal of Late Antiquity* 10, 270–7.
- Williams, C. A. (2010 [1999]), *Roman Homosexuality* (foreword by M. Nussbaum), Oxford.
- Williams, F. (ed.) (1978), *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo: A Commentary*, Oxford.
- Williams, G. D. (1995), 'Cleombrotus of Ambracia: Interpretations of a Suicide from Callimachus to Agathias', *CQ* 45, 154–69.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1974), *Cinna the Poet and Other Roman Essays*, Leicester.
- Wissmann, J. (2002), 'Hellenistic Epigrams as School-Texts in Classical Antiquity', in Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Hellenistica Groningana 6), Leuven, 215–30.
- Wissmann, J. (2010), 'Education', in Clauss, J. J. and Cuypers, M. (eds), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Oxford, 62–77.
- Wypustek, A. (2013), *Images of Eternal Beauty in Funerary Verse Inscriptions of the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman Periods* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 352), Leiden.
- Ypsilanti, M. (2003), 'Notes on Anyte', *Hermes* 131, 502–7.
- Ypsilanti, M. (2006), 'An Aspect of Leonidas' Reception in Later Epigrammatists and the Art of Variation: The Case of Fishermen's Epitaphs', *CPh* 101, 67–73.

- Ypsilanti, M. (2018), *The Epigrams of Crinagoras of Mytilene: Introduction, Text, Commentary*, Oxford.
- Zanandrea, S. (1987–9), 'Enigmistica bizantina: Considerazioni preliminari', *Miscellanea Marciana* 2–4, 141–57.
- Zanetto, G. and Ferrari, P. (eds) (1992), *Callimaco: Epigrammi*, Milan.
- Zanker, G. (2004), *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (Wisconsin Studies in Classics), Madison, WI.
- Zanker, P. (1974), *Klassizistische Statuen: Studien zur Veränderung des Kunstgeschmacks in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz.
- Zanker, P. (1995), *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*, trans. by A. Shapiro (Sather Classical Lectures 59), Berkeley, CA.
- Zeitlin, F. I. (2001), 'Visions and Revisions of Homer', in Goldhill, S. (ed.), *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge, 195–266.
- Zerwes, W. (1956), *Palladas von Alexandrien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der griechischen Epigrammdichtung*, Diss., Tübingen.
- Zingerle, J. (1926), 'Zu griechischen Grabgedichten', *JÖAI* 23, 361–412.

General Index

Terms in bold also appear in the *Index Locorum*.

- Abdera 163
 Abou Billou 168
 Academy 237, 289 n. 6, 292 n. 19, 300–1
 Acarnania 166
Aceratus Grammaticus 161
 Achaea 164–6
 Achaemenids 48
 Achilles 79, 125, 149–50, 158–9, 161,
 181 n. 29, 186, 245
 Acrisius 253–4, 256–8, 262, 271
 acrostic 74, 78, 80
Adaeus 95, 100, 161
 Adami, Giuseppe 134
 Adonis 131 n. 47, 217
 Adrasteia 279
 Aemilianus Maurus 121–2
Aemilianus of Nicaea 61 table 4.1
 Aeneas 147
 aenigmata *see* riddles
 Aeschines 162 n. 37
Aeschylus 38 table 3.1.1, 151 n. 47, 163, 250,
 254 n. 19, 277
 Aetolia 164–7
 Aetolian League 5
 afterlife 180 n. 27, 187, 202–6, 303–4
Agathias 6 n. 41, 118, 124, 203 n. 29, 207–8,
 278 n. 31, 280, 286, 343–4, 346–9
 Cycle 11 n. 64, 16, 118, 245 n. 29, 249,
 269, 272–3, 277–8, 281, 282 n. 44,
 283, 285–7, 290, 342 n. 13, 343–4,
 348–50, 352
 Agesilaus 38 table 3.1.5, 43, 165 n. 65
 Agoracritus 215–16
 Agrigentum 336–7
 Ajax 93, 158, 161
Alcaeus 86, 95, 235
Alcaeus of Messene 21, 86, 95–6, 99, 217,
 226–7, 230, 242, 328 n. 18
 Alcmena 255, 257 n. 36, 338
Aldhelm of Malmesbury 130 n. 43, 132 n. 50
 Alexander the Great 15–16, 155, 161, 164,
 272, 274–6, 281, 287
 Alexandria 40, 49, 87, 182 n. 36, 238, 324–6,
 329, 333 n. 31
Alexis 144, 234
 alphabetical order of poems in a
 collection 51–65, 80
 Ambracia 164, 303
Ammianus 11 n. 64, 311–12, 318–19
Ammonides 317–19
 Amor 242 n. 24, 243–5
 Amorgos 152 n. 50
 Amphis 255
 Amphitryon 338
Anacreon 8, 86, 96, 163, 290 n. 14, 298 n. 51,
 330–1, 335 n. 42
 Anacreontic metre 38–9 table 3.1.16
 Anastasius 284 n. 53
 Anatolia 147 n. 36, 216
 Ancyra 170 n. 91
 Andromache 124–6, 149–50, 183 n. 43
 Anne (the mother of the Virgin Mary) 132
Antagoras 237
 Anthology/anthologies 9, 12–14, 21, 36, 52–3,
 54 n. 23, 55, 56 n. 30, 58 n. 40, 59,
 60 n. 45, 71–3, 80–1, 87, 102, 124,
 126, 128, 140, 155, 160, 162, 168,
 170–1, 173, 233, 242, 260, 277 n. 23,
 339, 348
 Greek 5, 6 n. 39, 10, 14, 19, 27, 30, 66–7,
 71–2, 74–8, 80–2, 116, 119, 141, 157–9,
 161–8, 171–5, 189, 213, 233 n. 2, 249,
 258, 269, 289 n. 9, 307, 324, 326–7,
 340 n. 1, 343, 348
 Palatine 13, 52, 55–6, 66, 68, 75–82,
 119–34, 289
 Planudean 56, 72, 80, 82, 203 n. 25, 286,
 289, 327
 private 35–50, 169, 174
 sample-books 160, 168–71, 173–4
 Anticyra 156
 Antigone 89
 Antigonus Doson 165
 Antimachus 74 n. 30, 92, 311
 Antioch 147, 333 n. 31, 347
 Antiope 249
Antipater of Sidon 9 n. 55, 11 n. 64, 27, 67,
 158, 161, 162 n. 36, 163, 165, 217,
 226–7, 229–30, 294 n. 34, 318
Antipater of Thessalonica 6 n. 41, 11 n. 64,
 14, 31–2, 58 n. 39, 63 n. 60, 92–3,
 98–9, 103, 114–17, 161, 198 n. 16, 200,
 205, 253–4, 260–3, 266, 268, 270–1,
 294–6, 319

- Antiphanes (comic poet)** 127–8 and n. 33, 129
Sappho 127
- Antiphanes of Macedon** 58–9, 100 n. 63
- Antiphilus of Byzantium** 6 n. 41, 11 n. 64, 22, 57, 58 n. 39, 60, 61 and table 4.1, 63, 89, 95, 98, 161, 197–8, 299, 301
- Antistius** 217, 227
- Anyte** 10 n. 61, 11 n. 64, 94, 155, 163–4, 166, 171, 173–4, 198 n. 15
- Apamea Cibotus** 158 n. 17
- Apelles** 318–20
- Aphrodisias** 159, 173–4
- Aphrodite** 8, 58 n. 39, 97, 106–7, 233–5, 237, 239, 241–2, 244, 245 n. 29, 253, 260 n. 52, 261–3, 267–9, 273, 318–19
Aphrodite Anadyomene 318–20, 322 fig. 18.5
Aphrodite of Cnidus 58 n. 39, 318–20, 321 fig. 18.4
- Apollo** 22, 29 n. 60, 105, 222, 256, 282
- Apollodorus**
Bibliotheca 131 n. 47
- Apollonides** 58–60, 62, 196 n. 13
- Apollonius of Rhodes** 91 n. 23, 146, 147 n. 36, 148
Argonautica 217, 234, 242
 and Cybele 216–17, 226 and n. 40
- Apollophanes** 255
- apology, literary** 292 n. 24, 294, 298 n. 49
- Apuleius** 238
- Arabius** 343–4, 348–9
- Aratus** 68–9, 99
- Archias** 9 n. 55, 11 n. 64, 93, 99 n. 58
- Archilochus** 6 n. 42, 86, 87 n. 7, 96–7, 115, 185–6
- Archytas** 72
- Ares** 24 n. 37, 28, 58, 242 n. 22, 244–5, 318
- Argentarius** 11 n. 64
- Argos** 194, 257 n. 36
- Aristocles** 299 n. 54
- Aristodemus of Alexandria** 162
- Aristomenes** 161
- Ariston** 107–8, 110
- Aristophanes** 79, 122–3, 252, 289, 295 n. 38
 fr. 545 K-A 132 n. 51
Wasps 122–3
- Aristophon** 234, 242
- Aristotle** 68, 72, 176, 178–80, 183 nn. 41 and 43, 188 nn. 69–70, 234 n. 6, 299–301
Peripatetics 4, 290
Poetics 131 n. 46, 179
pseudo-Peplos 4
Rhetoric to Alexander 131 n. 46
Rhetoric 178–9
- arrangement of poems in a collection** 4, 12–13, 51–65, 107–8, 173, 279
- Arsinoe II** 45 n. 48, 49, 273, 274 n. 6
 Arsinoe-Aphrodite 47–8, 273
- Arsinoe III** 166 n. 74
- Arsinoites (Fayum)** 38–9 table 3.1 nos. 2 and 16, 44
- art** 2, 13, 15–16, 87, 177–8, 182, 233–4, 236, 241 n. 19, 242–3, 270, 272, 274, 277, 289 n. 5, 307–23, 327–37, 339, 341–4, 349, 352–3
- art criticism** 311, 317
- Artemis** 24 n. 36
- Asclepiades** 5, 7, 9, 11 n. 64, 43 n. 40, 47–8, 74 n. 30, 86–8, 95–6, 98, 99 n. 58, 108, 140, 167, 195 n. 12, 249–53, 255–6, 258, 263, 265–6, 268–9, 307
- Asclepiades of Tragilus** 132
- Asclepiodotus** 173–4
- Asclepius** 32, 274, 320
- Assyrians** 279, 281, 284
- Astyanax** 152 n. 49
- Atarneus** 104, 300 n. 57
- Athena** 27, 29, 33, 92, 149–50, 222, 242, 275, 293 n. 28, 318–19
- Athenaeus** 121–4, 127–8, 130, 132, 249, 258, 288
Deipnosophists 5, 120
- Athens** 32–3, 72, 108, 162, 170 n. 91, 205, 214–15, 278–80, 282, 293
- Athenians** 33, 81, 214–15, 273 n. 2, 276, 278–83, 286
- Attica** 48, 162, 166, 170 n. 91, 204, 214
- Augustin of Hippo** 227
- Augustus** 61, 111, 113, 242 n. 24, 270, 320
- Aulus (Augustan sculptor)** 242 n. 24
- Ausonius** 5, 277 n. 27
- Austin, J. L.** 293 n. 26
- Automedon** 298–9
- Avars** 351
- Babylon** 284
- Bacchylides** 185–6
- bad artists** 308–10, 342
- Bambyce** 238
- Basil Megalomytes** 127–9
- Bassus** 260, 264–6, 270, 283
- Bathyllus** 330 n. 27
- Belisarius** 283
- Beroia** 156 n. 6
- Bianor** 57, 60, 61 and table 4.1, 62, 197
- Bithynia** 169 n. 89
- blame in poetry** 7 n. 46, 8, 15–16, 67, 153, 188–9, 235, 237, 244–5, 249–71, 290–1, 294–303, 310–11
- Blemmyes** 285
- body (σῶμα)** 15, 192, 195, 202–6, 208–9, 302–3, 353

- book epigram *see* epigram, literary
 books 2, 9–10, 12, 35–7, 66–70, 85–6, 106,
 108, 154, 160, 170, 173–4, 180, 183
 Bosphorus 343, 347
 Bosra 172 nn. 99–100
 boundaries 15, 192–3, 196, 200, 206, 208–9,
 269, 344–5, 348
 Bundy, E. L. 290, 292 nn. 22 and 24, 293 n. 26,
 294 n. 33, 301 n. 64
 cap 292
 foil 289, 292, 295, 298 n. 50, 302
 Busr al-Hariri 173 n. 103
 Byzantium/Byzantine 5, 10, 14, 72, 77, 81,
 120, 123–4, 126–8, 131–2, 169, 260,
 280 n. 35, 285–6, 289, 304 n. 78, 325,
 326 n. 10, 327, 333, 334 n. 36, 339,
 343 n. 15, 344, 347, 350–1, 353

 Cadmus 241
 Caesar (G. Julius) 320
 Caesarea-Hadrianoupolis 159
 Calaf (Persian prince) 133
Callimachus 11 n. 64, 14–15, 20, 22–4,
 43 n. 40, 68, 70, 74, 85–7, 89–90, 92,
 94–6, 98–9, 100 n. 63, 101, 103–8, 111,
 113–18, 141–2, 148, 150–1, 157, 164,
 173, 182–4, 188 n. 68, 189, 194 n. 9,
 195, 199, 204, 214, 222–3, 230 n. 48,
 239, 282, 291, 299 n. 52, 302–4,
 307, 311
 and Cybele 216–17
 Hecale 104, 113–14
 Callicrates 273
 Calypso 45
 Cape Zephyrium 273
 Capitolium 131
 Caria 165 n. 66
 Cassandra 82, 152 n. 49
 cats 207–9
Catullus 5, 15, 74, 109, 189, 214
 and Attis 213, 221, 227 n. 43, 228–32
 Cavafis, Constantinos 6
 Celaenae 222
Cephalas 55–6, 76–7, 81, 119–20, 123 n. 17,
 124–6, 128, 173
 Cerameicus 25
 Ceres 150 n. 44
 Chaeronea 167 n. 78
 charade 130–2, 340–2
 Charis 345–6, 348
 Chios 165 n. 60
 Chosroes I 283
 Chosroes II 286
 Christianity/Christian/Christians 5, 16,
 131–2, 204 n. 30, 304 n. 76, 324–9,
 339–40, 350–3

Christodorus 11 n. 64
Chrysippus 131 n. 46
Cicero 336–7
 Cilicia 165
 Circe 144–5
Cleanthes 234 n. 6, 297–8
Clearchus of Soli 124 n. 18, 234 n. 6
 Cleobulina 124 n. 18
Cleobulus of Lindos 133
 Cleombrotus of Ambracia 291, 302–3
 Cleonymus 122–3
 Colonia Sakkaia Maximianopolis
 173 n. 103
 Colophon 137
 Coluthus 284 n. 53
 comedy 8, 10 n. 59, 14, 38 table 3.1.1,
 45 n. 49, 88–90, 95, 123, 144,
 234, 242, 252, 254–6, 259, 260 n. 52,
 308, 310, 313–14, 330
 New Comedy 8, 44, 251
Cometas 69–70, 79
 compassion 179, 181, 183, 185, 187–9
 competition 3, 8, 10, 15, 51, 92, 121, 192, 222,
 343 n. 17, 345–9, 353
 compilation (*see also* anthology) 4–5, 13,
 51–65, 73, 80, 124, 131–2
 consolation 141–2, 144–5, 146 n. 33, 147–8,
 153, 180 n. 27, 183, 291 n. 18
 Constantine 5 n. 33, 325, 327 n. 15, 333,
 334 n. 36
 Constantine Cephalas *see* Cephalas
 Constantine Lascaris 82
 Constantine the Rhodian 124
 Constantinople *see* Byzantium
 constative utterance 292–3
Cornelius Longus 277, 279
 Corupedium 169–70
 Cos 165, 320
 Crantor 237
Crates the Cynic 294 n. 35
 Crete 24, 60, 62, 86 n. 6, 94, 165 n. 62
 Cribiore, Raffaella 36, 45
Crinagoras 11 n. 64, 14, 57, 61 and table 4.1,
 98, 103, 111–15, 117, 236
 Cristopher of Mytilene 125 n. 25, 126
 Croesus 335 n. 43
 Cupid 236, 242
 Cybele 15, 213–33
 and Apollonius of Rhodes *see* Apollonius of
 Rhodes
 and Callimachus *see* Callimachus
 cult of 15, 213–17, 224, 226 n. 40, 227,
 229–32
 and galli *see* galli
 and the lion 15, 213–15, 217–18, 221,
 224–32

Cybele (*cont.*)

- music 213–17, 219–20, 225, 227, 229,
231–2 (*see also* epigram, Cybele's
music in)
- tympāna* (τύμπανα; drums) 215–16,
224–8, 230

Cyclades 111

Cynegeirus 277–8, 280

Cynics 238, 240, 289, 294 n. 32, 295–6

Cyrus 67, 335 n. 43

Cyzicus 148, 217

Damagetus 86, 158, 164–7, 174

Damon 235–6, 245, 258 n. 41

Danae *see* Zeus, and Danae

Daphne 346–7

Daphnis 94–5, 190

Dara 283

Davis, G. 294 n. 33, 297 n. 47, 298 n. 50,
300 n. 56, 302 n. 65death 14–15, 59–60, 63–4, 137–53, 154–75,
179 n. 17, 180 n. 27, 182–6, 189–90,
192–209, 220, 245, 278, 302–3, 350

narratives about in later epigram 91–3, 95

dedication, religious act (*see also* epigram,
dedicatory) 1–2, 24–5, 27, 31, 47, 69,
71, 106–7, 167, 213, 217–20, 291, 320

Deianeira 340 n. 2, 341

deictic *see* deixis

deixis 22, 30, 33–4, 69

first person 13, 22–3

dialogue 13, 22–4

Delos 27–8, 29 n. 60, 30 nn. 63 and 65

Delphi 167

Demeter 104, 121, 145, 186, 215, 216 n. 15

Demetrius 165 n. 62, 166

Demetrius Angelus 81 n. 57

Demetrius of Phalerum 335 n. 39

Democritus 318

Demodocus 183–4, 189

Demosthenes 72, 167 n. 78, 234

description (of inscribed object) 22, 33–4

ecphrastic dialogue 13, 20, 25–7, 29–30, 32

lists of dedications 13, 25–6, 27–32

dialogue 6 n. 41, 7, 10, 20, 22–4, 165, 242, 337

Diocles of Carystus 196–7

Diodorus of Iasus 86 n. 3

Diodorus of Sardes 61 table 4.1, 63–4, 161**Diodorus Zonas** 61 table 4.1, 95**Diogenes the Athenian** 216

Diogenes the Cynic 62, 240, 294–6

Diogenes Laertius 55 n. 27, 67, 72, 203–4,
240, 289 n. 9, 290 n. 11

Diogenianus 277 n. 23

Diomedes 252

Dionysius of Halicarnassus 151 n. 45

Dionysus 58, 121, 130, 215, 219, 297,
312 n. 24, 330 n. 27, 348–9

Diospolis (Thebes east) 38 table 3.1.7, 41

Dioscorides 9, 11 n. 64, 86, 87 n. 7, 96–100,
161, 173, 217–18, 221–5, 228–9, 259**Diotimus** 89, 157, 164, 173

Diphilus 255

dodecasyllables 77–9, 123 n. 14, 129, 132

Doliones 217

Dosiadas 77

double meaning 120–4

Echo 279

ecphrasis (ἐκφρασις) (*see also* epigram,
ecphrastic) 7, 16, 25, 47–8, 86, 91 n. 23,
242–3, 274–5, 280, 285, 307–23,
324–38, 342

of viewing 13, 22, 25–7, 29–32, 274

of reading 19, 25–7, 29–32, 274

editions/editing/editors 37, 45 n. 49, 53–65,
70, 74 n. 30, 75–7, 79, 87, 103, 107,
119, 124, 162, 173, 233 n. 1, 242,
245–6, 260, 289 n. 9

Eëtion 125

Egypt 12, 38 table 3.1 nos. 4–6, 8, and 12–14,
42 n. 33, 47–9, 98, 156, 158, 160, 168,
171, 239 n. 14, 273, 275, 285, 333 n. 31

Eion 162 n. 37

Elea 203

elegiac couplet 1–2, 2 n. 5, 10, 38–9 table 3.1
nos. 8 and 17, 39–40, 85, 123 n. 14,
126, 129, 138–41, 155, 158, 160, 162,
166, 174 n. 105, 332elegy 3, 7–9, 38 table 3.1 nos. 10 and 14, 40,
86–8, 90–3, 100 n. 63, 155, 160, 168,
187, 189 n. 75, 236, 242–3, 251 n. 6,
260 n. 51, 261 n. 55, 270–1, 276,
308 n. 5

Elephantine 38 table 3.1.10, 39–40

Elias of Alexandria 68, 69 n. 8

Elis 165, 166 n. 74

Elpenor 144–5

emotion 14–15, 25, 91, 93, 150, 162 n. 41,
176–91, 235, 239, 250 n. 2, 263, 310,
322, 338 n. 48

ancient theory of 177–82

excessive 181, 187

false 188–90

literary 177, 179–84, 186, 188–91

modern theory of 177–8, 179 n. 21,

180 n. 23, 181, 183 n. 42

sharing of 177–84, 186–7, 322

social function of 176–85, 187–8

enargeia (ἐνάργεια) 322–3

encomiastic *see* praise

Ephesus 188

Ephippus 256

epic poetry 3, 79, 87, 90 n. 20, 91, 98–100,
144–5, 149–51, 154–7, 171–2, 174,
181 n. 29, 183–4, 186, 189, 194 n. 10,
233, 236, 257–8, 261, 280 n. 34,
302 n. 65, 337–8, 348–9

Epicharmus

fr. 147 K-A 132 n. 51

Epicurus 109 n. 24, 110, 289 n. 6, 293,
299–300

Epicureanism 109 and nn. 24–5,
110 and n. 27, 114, 117, 289 n. 6,
297 n. 47, 299, 304 n. 75

Epidaurus 29 n. 60

epideictic *see* epigram, epideictic

epigram (*see also* anthology)

allegory in 48, 328, 350–1

ἄλλο 38–9 table 3.1.16, 40–3, 45, 78, 170

‘anthological impulse’ 41, 44

architectural 45–50

bucolic 86, 190

collection (*see* anthology)

commissioned 3, 40–1, 44, 49, 154–5,
159–60, 162, 164, 166–9, 174

Cybele’s music in 213–14, 217–32

dedicatory (*see also* dedication) 1–3, 7,
22–5, 27–34, 42 n. 33, 45–7, 49, 70–1,
85–6, 90 n. 22, 94–5, 100, 105–8, 174,
182, 213, 217–20, 223–6, 227 n. 41,
259–60 n. 50, 282, 307, 314 n. 31,
332, 349

diachronic developments in 12–14,
85–101, 120, 155, 180–1, 188, 249, 271

ecphrastic 7 n. 47, 16, 25–32, 47, 85–6,
90 n. 22, 95, 100, 144, 242–3, 274,
280, 298 n. 51, 307–11, 314, 317–20,
327–30, 334, 336–9, 342–9, 352

epideictic 12, 52, 55 n. 28, 67, 80–1,
162 n. 37, 250

erotic 7–8 and n. 51, 15, 39 table 3.1.17, 52,
55, 63, 76–7, 85–6, 94–7, 100, 102, 108,
113 n. 33, 181 n. 29, 182, 249–50,
253 n. 15, 255, 258–9, 260, 266, 269,
297–8, 307, 308 n. 5, 319

funerary/grave/sepulchral/tomb (*see also*
epitaph) 1–3, 6–7, 14–15, 19–20,
25–6, 38 table 3.1 nos. 8 and 12–13,
39–42, 43 n. 40, 49, 60 n. 46, 62–4,
67, 70–1, 80, 85–6, 89–90, 92, 94–5,
100, 111–12, 116–17, 137–53, 154–75,
176–91, 192–209, 213, 219–21, 282,
289–95, 302–3, 307, 314 n. 31, 332,
345 n. 22

ideology 13, 15, 36, 44–50, 160, 272–87,
344, 350, 353

in schools 36, 38–9, 41–50

inscriptional 1–3, 6, 9–10, 13–15, 19–34,
40–1, 64 n. 65, 66, 69–72, 85–6, 92,
100, 137–53, 155–75, 177, 180–1,
183 nn. 39 and 42, 184–5, 188–9, 202,
204–6, 208, 276, 282–4, 286, 289–90,
292 n. 19, 302 n. 66, 304 n. 77, 307,
314, 332, 343–4, 346, 352–3

literary 2–3, 6–7, 9–10, 13–16, 19–34,
35–50, 66–82, 85–101, 138, 140–6,
148, 150–3, 157–75, 176–91, 233,
249–50, 277–9, 283, 285, 287, 289–91,
292 n. 19, 297, 302, 304 n. 77, 307,
314, 353

literary criticism in 68–9, 86–7, 311

metrical variation in 40 and n. 28, 41,
128–9, 138–41

miniaturization in 14, 85–101

of bucolic poetry 94–5

of comedy 88–90

of didactic poetry 98–100

of narrative elegy 91–3

of the paraclausithyron 89 n. 15, 95–7

of the propempticon 86 n. 3, 97–8

of tragedy 88–90

name of the deceased in 139, 143, 155, 163,
172, 185, 193, 195–6, 209

on poets 6, 38 table 3.1 nos. 8 and 13, 42–3,
49, 62, 66–71, 80–2, 86–7, 90, 99, 115,
155, 161, 203–4, 292 n. 21

poetic books of 9, 12, 35–7, 41, 85–6, 100,
107, 142, 148 n. 40, 170, 174, 177, 180

political subjects in 12, 15–16, 86, 161, 185,
187, 272–87, 292 n. 21, 342 n. 13

sequence 13, 36–7, 41, 43, 49–50, 53–7, 61,
105, 107–8, 110, 114, 132, 189 n. 79,
233–46, 298 n. 51, 343–9

skoptic/satirical 7–8, 12, 15–16, 79, 85 n. 1,
86 n. 3, 87 n. 9, 120, 130 n. 43, 188–9,
249–50, 255–6, 258–60, 263, 266, 269,
271, 290–1, 294–5, 299, 302, 307–23,
339–42, 352

sympotic 7, 9, 38–9 table 3.1 nos. 10 and
16, 39–40, 63, 85–6, 89–90, 95, 100,
120, 158, 297–9

Vienna epigrams papyrus (G 40611) 5, 7,
12, 43, 258 n. 42, 307 n. 2

epigramma (ἐπίγραμμα) 1 n. 2, 70 and n. 12
epigrammatists, generations of 14, 87–8, 90,
92, 95–6, 99–101, 103–18

epilogue 66, 70, 75, 89

Epirus 164

epitaph 3–4, 14, 25, 40, 69, 71, 86, 111–12,
138–41, 142 n. 13, 143, 145–8, 150–2,
178–81, 183, 189–90, 192, 302

military 14, 92, 154–75

Erebus 237

- Erechtheus 281
 Eretria 193–4
 eros (love), theme of 7–8, 15, 94–6, 98–100,
 161, 180 n. 27, 182–3, 220, 233–46,
 249–53, 255, 258–9, 263, 264 n. 66,
 266–7, 269, 291, 297–8, 310 (*see also*
 epigram, erotic)
 Eros 15, 57, 61, 76, 96, 233–46, 251–2, 263,
 266 n. 72, 269, 297–8, 315 n. 34,
 327–31, 348
 Erycius 58 n. 39, 95, 161, 218–21, 229–30, 232
 eschatology 303–4 (*see also* afterlife,
 skepticism, Christianity)
 Eteocles 44
 ethics 14, 44, 47, 103–18
 ethopoia (ἠθοποιία) 80, 96 n. 45, 143,
 280 n. 34, 318
 Euboea 139 n. 6, 194, 301
 Eubulus 234, 240 n. 17, 255, 264
 Euenus 58 n. 39, 318
 Euphron 276
 Euripides 38 table 3.1.1, 44, 90 n. 20, 183,
 216 n. 15, 219, 235, 240 n. 16, 253,
 254 n. 19, 304, 338
 Oedipus 132
 Euripus 301
 Europa 249, 255, 265–7
 Eusebius 130 n. 43, 335 n. 44
 Eustathius Canicles 125 n. 25
 Eustathius Macrembolites 125 n. 25, 131
 Evander 104 n. 5
 Ezr'a 172 n. 97
- feelings *see* emotion
 festival/festivals 2 n. 5, 98, 215 n. 11, 218,
 220 n. 28
 First World War 6 n. 37
 fish 197, 199–202, 205–9, 249, 256–8
 food 106–9, 117, 129, 171, 249, 256–8, 288
 funerary epigram *see* epigram, funerary
- Gadara 108
 Galatians 276
 Galen 56 n. 33, 81, 187 n. 65
 galli (γάλλοι) 15, 213–32
 hagnos (ἁγνός) 223–5
 history of the name 214
 and the Romans 213, 230 n. 48
 Ganymedes 143 n. 18
 gardens 10 n. 60, 16, 165 n. 66, 190, 236,
 299 n. 53, 312 n. 26, 339–53
 Garland 72, 339
 of Philip *see* Philip of Thessalonica
 of Meleager *see* Meleager
 Gaza 159
 generals *see* military
- genre 2, 4–5, 7–10, 12–16, 35, 37, 39, 40 n. 23,
 43, 45, 49, 52, 55, 67, 73–4, 85–101,
 120, 126, 132, 148–9, 155, 160, 167,
 174, 180, 184 n. 45, 208, 228 n. 45, 232,
 236–7, 249–50, 258, 259 n. 50, 260, 264,
 266, 270, 272–4, 294 n. 33, 297–302,
 307–8, 312 n. 25, 339, 343–4, 349
 geopoetics 48
 George of Pisidia 286, 350
 Ghariye-Sharquie 172 n. 100
 Glaucus 252
 gods 8, 15, 23–4, 45, 47, 92, 185, 234, 242,
 245 n. 29, 255–6, 262, 275, 291 n. 18,
 302, 318 n. 39, 325–9, 331, 352
 (*see also* Amor, Aphrodite, Apollo,
 Ares, Artemis, Asclepius, Athena,
 Charis, Cupid, Cybele, Demeter,
 Dionysus, Erebus, Eros, Hades, Hebe,
 Hecate, Helios, Hephaestus, Hera,
 Hermes, Heracles, Jupiter, Nemesis,
 Nike, Pan, Persephone, Pluto,
 Poseidon, Priapus, Rhea, Terminus,
 Tyche, Venus, Zeus)
 gold 28 n. 56, 30 n. 63, 59–60, 105, 249–71
 Gorgias 179, 234
 Goths 333 nn. 33–4
 Gozzi, Carlo 133, 134 n. 57
 Gregory of Nazianzus 11 n. 64, 15, 72, 78–9,
 189–90
 grave epigram *see* epigram, funerary
 grief 14, 137–53, 156 n. 10, 177–9, 180 n. 27,
 182–90, 207, 217 (*see also* emotion)
- Hades 64, 126, 144–5, 146 n. 35, 148, 152 n. 50,
 185–6, 202, 205, 259, 295–6, 302
 Hagia Sophia 285, 352
 hare 57, 61, 198, 209
 Harpocraton 56 n. 33
 Hebe 105
 Hecate 148, 350–1, 353
 Hector 125, 149–52, 161, 185 n. 54
 Hecuba 152 n. 49
 Hedylus 249, 256–9, 263, 269
 Hegesander of Delphi 288
 Hegesippus 194, 196, 200
 Helen 64
 Helios 148
 Hephaestus 244
 Hera 242, 319, 343
 Heracles 24, 126, 148, 183 n. 43, 240 n. 16,
 256, 275, 294–5, 336–42
 Heraclius 286, 350–1, 353
 Heraclitus of Halicarnassus 19–20, 183, 204
 Hermes 240 n. 16, 255
 Hermias 300
 Hermione 194

- Herodas** 32, 178 n. 10
Herodes Atticus 64 n. 65
 Herodes of Hassaia 160, 168
Herodotus 1 n. 2, 4, 28 n. 59, 276, 283, 335 n. 43
Hesiod 42 n. 33, 49, 68, 99, 159, 233, 257 n. 36, 261–2, 267, 269
 Hesperides 339–41
Hesychius of Miletus 351
 hetaera 8, 256–7, 259 n. 50, 260–1, 264
 hexameter 1, 29 n. 60, 77–80, 85, 132, 138–41, 143 n. 18, 151–4, 157, 166, 186, 265
 Hieron (Heraion/Hiereion) 343, 346–9
 Hipparchia of Maroneia 294 n. 35
 Hipparchus 63–4
 Hipponax 6 n. 42, 63, 86, 96
Homer 38 table 3.1 nos. 4 and 7, 41–4, 46–7, 49, 54, 64, 67–9, 79–80, 93 n. 33, 98, 112, 115, 131, 145, 150–2, 154–7, 159, 163 n. 48, 164, 168–9, 171, 181 n. 29, 183 n. 41, 184 n. 45, 185–9, 202, 216 n. 15, 245, 258, 261, 269, 274 n. 6, 293, 294 n. 33, 304 n. 76, 348
Iliad 42 n. 32, 46, 79–80, 149–52, 156, 185–6, 192, 202 n. 23, 245, 252, 257
Odyssey 42 n. 32, 44, 46, 112–13, 144–5, 151, 185, 258, 262, 304
 Homeric hero 4, 157–8, 160–1, 174, 186, 275 n. 13, 292 n. 23, 337–8
Homeric Hymn to Demeter 145–6, 148–9, 186
 homonymy 14, 121–3
Honestus 61 table 4.1, 207
Horace 74, 294 n. 33, 302 n. 65
 Hyagnis 222
 Hylas 144, 146–7 and n. 36, 148
 Hymenaeus 89, 185, 218
 Hymettus 46, 48
 Hyrentho 223
 iambus 1 and n. 4, 8–9, 40, 79, 86–8, 90, 308
 iambic trimeter 38 table 3.1.12, 123 n. 14, 128, 332
Ibycus 96
 ice 206–7, 209
 iconoclasm 324–38
 secular 329
 Ida 222, 226, 228, 231, 319
 imitation 7–8, 14, 51–3, 59, 68 n. 5, 102–3, 107–18, 143, 167, 190–1, 198 n. 16, 217, 221, 226, 230, 243, 280, 317 n. 37
 inscription/inscribed 1–2, 9, 13, 48, 69–72, 75, 85, 88, 89 n. 19, 90, 92, 100, 131, 137–9, 148, 152, 154–6, 162–3, 168, 172–3, 177, 180–1, 185 n. 54, 188–9, 192 n. 1, 202, 204, 216 n. 18, 282–3, 304 n. 76, 307, 314, 332–3, 343–4, 346, 350, 352–3
 intertext/intertextuality 8, 10, 13, 57–8, 60, 63–4, 109 n. 22, 183, 186–7, 229, 251–2, 255, 258, 264, 270, 280
 inventories (temple, of dedications) 27–9
 invitation poems 109–10
 Ios 67
 irony 7, 19, 52, 92, 161, 171, 174–5, 189, 193–4, 197–8, 201–2, 209 n. 40, 245, 250 n. 2, 251–2, 264, 303, 307, 310–11, 314, 317, 331–2, 341
Isaac Argyros 132–3
Isocrates 301 n. 61
 Italy 102–3, 104 n. 5, 108, 111–12, 114 n. 37
 Ithaca 113
 Jacobs, Friedrich 121
 Jocasta 44
 John of Gaza 77
John Geometres 72, 79, 126
John Lydus 284, 333, 334 n. 36
 John Mauropous 125 n. 25, 126
 John the Baptist 131–2
John Tzetzes 132
 Julia Balbilla 3 n. 24
Julian (the Emperor) 124, 125 n. 25, 284, 347
Julian of Egypt 11 n. 64, 318
 Jupiter 131, 270
 justice 114, 197, 267, 291–2, 341, 352
 Justinian 16, 272–3, 277–8, 281, 283–7, 342–4, 346, 350, 352
Juvenal 230 n. 48, 329
 juxtaposition of poems in a collection 10, 13, 54–5, 57–61, 108, 245
 Kavadh 283
 kleos (κλέος) 2 n. 7, 54 and n. 23, 143, 154–7, 174, 186, 190, 291–3, 303
 komos (κῶμος) 250–1
 kosmos (κόσμος) 54, 352
 Laertes 159
 land 60–2, 122–3, 127, 192, 196–200, 206–9, 328, 343–9, 352
 laudandus 159, 285, 290, 292 n. 23, 293, 296, 298, 303
 laughter 234–41, 242 n. 23, 244, 250, 252, 260 n. 52, 323
 Lazarus 79
 Lebadeia 282
 Leda 249, 255, 259 n. 49, 265–7, 270
 Leonidas (Spartan king) 283
Leonidas of Alexandria 28, 158, 259, 309
Leonidas of Tarentum 11 n. 64, 14, 27, 29–31, 43, 68 n. 6, 80, 90 n. 21, 94, 103–18, 161, 196, 199–202, 205–8, 218, 225, 318–19

- Leontius Scholasticus** 11 n. 64, 269 n. 84
 leptos (λεπτός) 311–13, 317
 Lesbos 111
Libanius 347
 literacy 41
 writing exercises 41–5, 49
 literary papyri *see* papyri, literary
 literary taste 37, 41, 43, 49, 87, 167
 litos (λίτος) 102–18
Livy 131
 Lobon of Argos 290
Longus 236
 lover's leap 303
Lucian 64, 73, 238, 240, 311 n. 21, 320
Lucillius 7, 11 n. 64, 15, 75 n. 33, 120 n. 4,
 188–9, 259, 309, 339–42, 352
 Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus 108–10,
 114 n. 37
Lucretius 231–2, 298 n. 49
 Lydia 139, 163–4
 Lycambes 38 table 3.1.12, 87 n. 7
 Lyceum 300
Lycophron 81–2
 Alexandra 81–2, 90 n. 20, 132
 lyric 7–9, 86–8, 90, 95–6, 168, 183–4, 186,
 298, 302 n. 65, 308 n. 5
 Lysippus 274
 Lystra 156 n. 6
- Macedonia 300 n. 55
 Macedonians 165, 167, 215 n. 6, 274–5, 281
Macedonius Consul 11 n. 64, 245 n. 29
Madaurus 333 n. 31
 manuscript 13–14, 69–82, 119, 124, 126, 128,
 140, 309, 320 n. 48
 Laurentianus 32.16 124
 Parisinus Gr. 968 128 n. 33
 Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 384 76 n. 37
 Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 690 124–5
 Marathon 113
 battle of 16, 33, 273, 277–81, 285–6
 Marcellus 113–14
Marcus Argentarius 58 n. 39, 61 table 4.1, 99
 Marcus Aurelius 77, 81 n. 56
 Marcus Terentius Varro *see* Varro
Marianus Scholasticus 242 n. 23
Marinus 77–8, 81 n. 56
 Marsyas
 and the invention of the aulos 222
Martial 5, 74, 225, 230 n. 48, 270, 294 n. 32, 341
 Mary (the Virgin Mary; Theotokos) 132,
 343, 351
 mathematical problems 119
 Maximus Planudes 69 n. 8, 124, 163, 279, 286,
 289, 309, 327
 Medea 245
- Medeios of Olynthus 274
 Medes 272, 276, 278–86
Meleager 11 n. 64, 13, 15, 26–7, 32, 51–5,
 57 n. 38, 62–3, 65, 75, 87, 95–6, 98,
 102–3, 105–8, 110, 114, 124, 130 n. 43,
 140, 166, 168, 173, 185 n. 56, 213,
 233–46, 259, 298 n. 51
 Memphis 38 table 3.1 nos. 1 and 15, 165, 169
 Memnon 3 n. 24
Menander 38 table 3.1.4, 144, 240 n. 16, 251,
 253–5, 258, 271 n. 88, 293, 296
 ‘mental painting’ 322–3
 Menippus 240
 messenger (motif in funerary epigrams) 89,
 148–51
 metapoetic imagery 59, 104, 115, 310–11
 metre 10, 81, 236–7, 265, 298 n. 49 (*see also*
 dodecasyllables, elegiac couplet,
 hexameter, iambic trimeter,
 pentadecasyllables, pentameters)
 of inscribed epigram 1–2, 26 n. 45, 29 n. 60,
 138–9, 155
- Michael Psellus** 125 n. 25, 131
 military 6, 14–17, 39–40, 45 n. 49, 59–60,
 86 n. 6, 92, 150, 154–78, 256, 270,
 272–86, 292 n. 21, 350–1
- Miltiades 277–9, 283, 285–6
Mimnermus 8, 141
 miniaturization 14, 70, 85–101, 155,
 183 n. 38, 308 n. 5, 315
- Mithridates 333 n. 34
Mnasalces 11 n. 64, 99
 mockery 7–8, 15, 79, 188–9, 206, 249–50,
 252–3, 255–6, 258–60, 262–6, 268–71,
 290, 294–5, 299–302, 308–11, 314–15,
 323, 332, 341–2
- Mopsopia 278
 Mopsuestia 343 n. 16
Moschus 234, 236, 239
Mucius Scaevola 61 table 4.1
Musaeus 269
 Muse/Muses 2 n. 6, 20, 39, 46, 49, 63, 66, 68,
 74 n. 33, 81–2, 99, 109, 111–13, 117,
 217, 297–8, 326
- Myron/Myron's cow 7, 25, 62, 310 n. 14,
 320 n. 50
- Myrrha 131
 myth 14, 92–3, 120, 123–6, 132–3, 144, 146,
 157, 214–15, 222–3, 234, 242, 249 n. 1,
 266 n. 72, 279, 285, 310, 318–19,
 340–2, 345–6, 349, 352
 burlesque of 8, 15, 249–71, 342 n. 12
 of the metallic races 261–2, 268
 mythological comedy 8, 249, 255–6, 260,
 264–6, 269
- Mytilene 164

- Naples 108, 289 n. 6
 Narcissus 144
 Nemea 282
 Nemesis 265 n. 70, 273, 277–9
 Neoptolemus of Parium 162
 Nereus 258
 Nero 188, 307, 309, 339–42, 350, 352–3
 Nessus 126, 341
 Nestor 157–8, 161, 261–2, 263 n. 61
 Nestor of Laranda 53
 Nicaea 170 n. 91
 Nicander 99
Nicarchus 7, 11 n. 64, 120 n. 4, 258 n. 41, 259, 311–12, 318–19
 Nicetas 286
 Nike 30 n. 63, 33–4, 284, 331 n. 29
 Nile 49
Nonnus of Panopolis 280–2, 286 n. 62, 348
 Nossis 96
 Notion 137–8, 140–6, 147 n. 36, 148, 150, 152–3

 occasional poetry 102–3
 octopus 57, 61, 198, 209
 Odysseus 109, 111, 113, 183–4, 189
Oedipodea 132
 Oedipus 126 n. 28, 132–3, 141
 Olympus 33, 92, 143 n. 18, 157, 202 n. 21, 205, 259, 270, 326–7, 338
 oracles 4 n. 29, 119, 214
 ostraca 13, 36–9, 41–4, 45 n. 49, 46, 49–50
 Oulipo 53–4
Ovid 15, 100, 150 n. 44, 236, 242–3, 246, 270–1
 Metamorphoses 131 n. 47

 pachys (παχύς) 310–11
 phantasia (φαντασία) 322–3, 346
 Palaestina Tertia 170 n. 91
Palladas 5, 11 n. 64, 12, 16, 158, 242 n. 23, 259, 266–8, 298 n. 51, 324–38
 P. CtYBR inv. 4000 5, 12, 266 n. 72, 289 n. 8, 324, 326
 Palmyra 156 n. 8
 Pan 30 n. 66, 94–5, 130, 273, 277–80, 312 nn. 24 and 28, 349 n. 36
 Panaetius of Rhodes 68, 303 n. 70
 Panteleius 280 n. 34
 papyri 3, 5, 7, 10, 11 n. 64, 12 and n. 66, 35, 90 n. 20, 132 n. 51, 154–5, 162, 168, 170, 238, 239 n. 14, 258 nn. 41–2, 285, 289, 307 n. 2 (*see also* Posidippus, Milan (*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII* 309); Palladas, *P. CtYBR inv. 4000*; epigram, Vienna epigrams papyrus)
 literary 35–50
 symmeikton 39

Pamprepius 286
 paradox 120, 193, 223, 234–5, 237, 308
 paraphrase 32, 79, 125 n. 23
 paratext 14, 66, 73–82
 Paris 125, 269 n. 83, 319, 346
Parmenion 116–17, 260, 263–5, 271, 277, 279
 Paros 46, 48
 Parthians 272, 276, 317, 318 n. 42
 partridge 207–9
 Pasiphae 123
 Pasiteles 312
 passer-by in epigram 3, 7, 23, 26–7, 69, 139, 141 n. 11, 143, 148, 165, 188–9, 193, 296
 pathetic fallacy 190
 pathos 6, 91, 93, 139, 142, 144–6, 152, 177–8, 180 n. 23, 246
 Patras 164
 Patroclus 186, 245
 patrons/patronage 104 n. 6, 114 n. 37, 115–17, 154, 174, 261, 272–3, 276
Paul the Silentiary 11 n. 64, 67–9, 250, 259, 267–9, 278–80, 282, 285, 343–9
Pausanias 280 n. 35
 Peloponnese 164, 166
 Penelope 124
 pentadecasyllables 123 n. 14, 128
 pentameter 78, 163, 258
 in inscribed epigram 138–41, 143
 Perec, George 54
 performance 9–10, 39–40, 292–3
 Pergamum 81
 Persephone 145–6, 148, 151, 172, 186, 216 n. 15
 Perseus 254
 Persian Wars 15–16, 162 n. 36, 272–87
 Persians 15–16, 67, 133–4, 272, 273 n. 2, 274–6, 278–9, 281, 283–7, 351
 persona 49, 103–5, 107 and n. 18, 108, 111, 114, 118, 187, 192, 237, 240
 Pessinus 214, 223–4
 Pétis de la Croix, François 133
Petronius 189–90, 238
 Phaeacians 109, 111
 Phasis 277
 Pheidias 215–16, 273 n. 2
 Philadelphia 38 table 3.1 nos. 9 and 11, 40, 159 n. 22, 172 n. 100
 Philaenis 100 n. 62
 Philicus 38 table 3.1.13, 42–3 and n. 39
 Philip II of Macedonia 161, 164, 351
 Philip V of Macedonia 86 n. 6, 164–5, 226 n. 40

- Philip of Thessalonica** 13–14, 51–65, 87, 93,
102–4, 108–18, 124, 161, 198 n. 16,
205–7, 213, 218–21, 229–30, 232,
245 n. 29, 249–50, 253, 259–61, 270,
277 n. 26
- Philitas**
- Paignia* 124
- Philochorus** 4, 100, 162
- Philodemus** 11 n. 64, 14, 89, 98, 103, 108–10,
112–15, 117, 215–16, 218, 229 n. 47,
290 n. 14
- philosophy** 15–16, 38 table 3.1.15, 72, 87,
109–10, 177 n. 5, 178 n. 11, 179 n. 21,
180 n. 24, 182, 187, 188 n. 70, 233–5,
237, 239, 288–304, 345 n. 20
- philosophers** 16, 67, 72, 108, 177–9, 189,
288–304
- Philostratus** 64
- Photius** 72–3
- Phrygia** 214–19, 222–4, 231
- Phthia** 165
- Pillars of Heracles** 317, 319 n. 42
- Pindar** 154, 171, 216 nn. 15 and 18
- Pinytus** 204
- Piraeus** 121, 193
- Pisander of Rhodes** 161
- Piso** *see* Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus
- Pittacus** 86 n. 3, 104
- Pitys** 130
- Plataea** 92, 155, 282–3
- Plato** 68–70, 72, 180 n. 24, 189 n. 78, 202–4, 209,
215, 234–5, 238, 289 n. 6, 290 and n. 14,
291–3, 300, 301 n. 61, 302–4, 310, 319
- Plautus** 240 n. 16
- Pliny the Elder** 320
- Plutarch** 72, 276, 283, 335 n. 40
- Pluto** 172
- poetics, Indo-European** 133, 290 n. 15
- polemic (literary)** 79–80, 117, 188–90,
226 n. 40, 258
- Polemon of Ilium** 162
- politics** 5, 13, 15–16, 48, 86 n. 6, 104 n. 6, 111,
128, 161, 166, 185, 187, 272–87, 329
- Polyphemus** 147 n. 36, 148
- Pompeii** 314 n. 30
- Pompey** 333 n. 34
- Poppaea** 329 n. 22
- Poseidon** 31, 123, 259, 347–8
- Posidippus** 5, 11 n. 64, 12, 14–15, 20, 24, 26,
34, 35 n. 1, 38 table 3.1.1, 42, 43 n. 40,
45 n. 49, 47–8, 86–9, 91–2, 95–100,
141–3, 145, 147 n. 36, 150–3, 158, 167,
169, 174, 182, 184–7, 188 n. 68, 189,
195–6, 272–5, 281, 297–8
- Milan** (*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309*) 5, 11 n. 64, 12
and n. 66, 48, 86–8, 167, 274–5, 289 n. 8
- postface** 74, 77, 82
- Pound, Ezra** 6
- praise** 3, 7 n. 46, 8, 15–16, 67–8, 71, 79–80,
86 n. 6, 99, 155, 158, 161, 167, 272–87,
290–8, 300, 302–3, 307–8, 310–11,
314, 342
- Praxiteles** 32, 58 n. 39, 318 n. 39, 320
- preface** 56, 70, 74–6
- Presocratics** 238–9, 298 n. 49, 304 n. 76
- Priam** 82, 125, 150–2, 161, 181 n. 29
- Priapus** 319
- Priene** 314, 316 fig. 18.3
- Priscus** 159
- Proclus** 77
- Prodicus** 337
- proem** 51–2, 75, 77, 112, 242
- programmatic** 63, 74, 98 n. 53, 104, 107,
236, 297
- progymnasmata** (*προγυμνάσματα*) 277,
307 n. 1, 310 n. 17, 318
- projection (of reading)** 13, 21–2, 25, 27, 34,
73, 75
- prologue** 66, 74
- Prometheus** 250
- propaganda** 36 and n. 7, 272–87
- Propertius** 15, 242 n. 22, 243–4, 246
- Protesilaus** 63–4, 161
- Proteus** 256–8
- proxeny** 5, 165 n. 65, 167
- Ptolemies** 13, 15–16, 36, 40, 43 n. 39, 45–50,
86 n. 6, 154, 166 n. 74, 169, 238 n. 14,
273–6, 277 n. 28, 279, 281, 287
- Puccini, Giacomo** 133
- Turandot* 133–4
- pun** 72, 79, 120, 189 n. 79, 257, 303,
309 n. 12
- Pygmalion** 310
- Pyrrho** 289 n. 6, 302
- Pyrrhus** 125, 241 n. 21
- Pythagoras** 304 n. 77
- Pythias** 300 n. 57
- quarrel between philosophy and poetry** 16,
290, 297–302
- Quintilian** 123
- Institutio Oratoria* 123
- Quintus Maecius** 57
- readers** 9–10, 36–7, 63–4, 70, 73, 75, 120,
179–81, 186, 188, 195–6, 299 n. 53,
314 n. 31, 349
- reader response** 21, 176–82, 183 n. 41
- reading**
- inscriptions 4
- in literary epigram 13, 19, 21–32, 177,
180–1, 353

- in reality 13, 19, 21, 23–4, 25–6, 32–4,
 144, 177, 180, 353
 representation of 20–3, 26–7
 reception 2, 4 n. 24, 6 n. 37, 8 n. 52, 14, 36, 41,
 87, 90, 99, 105–18, 236 n. 8, 249
recusatio 298 and n. 50
 Renaissance 5–6
 reversal 308–11, 318
 Rhamnous 273 n. 2, 277–8
 Rhea 216 n. 18, 217–20, 225–7
 rhetoric 15, 147, 177–80, 221, 244, 277, 279,
 280 n. 34, 285, 290, 298 n. 50, 317,
 318 n. 39, 319, 322–3, 342 n. 14
Rhianus 214, 218–22, 225, 229, 232
 Rhodes 39 table 3.1.17, 98, 289 n. 6
 riddles 14, 20–1, 38 table 3.1.15, 80,
 119–34, 330
 role-playing 237, 239, 266
 Rome 15, 38 table 3.1.14, 61, 102, 104 n. 5,
 111, 114–15, 146, 170 n. 91, 214–15,
 227, 270, 284, 320, 342
Rufinus 11 n. 64, 260

 Salamina 282
Sannyrion 255
Sappho 8, 66, 69, 82, 96–7, 164, 204, 298
 Sardis 223–4
 Sassanians 16, 272–3, 278, 281–4
 satire *see* mockery and epigram, skoptic/
 satirical
 ‘satirical persuasion’ 323
Satyrus 243
 Scheria 109, 111
 Schiller, Friedrich 133, 134 n. 57
 school texts 13, 36, 38–9, 41–50, 80
 scribe 45 n. 49, 70, 75, 77–8, 80, 82, 163
 Scythians 284
 sea 60–2, 122–3, 127, 161, 192, 194–200,
 206–9, 235, 237–8, 244–5, 301, 328,
 343–9, 352
 Sebastopolis 157
 Second Sophistic 157
 Sejanus 329
 Seleucids 272
 Semele 130, 264 n. 65
 sensation 181
 sepulchral epigram *see* epigram, funerary
 Sergius 350–3
 series 7, 13, 15, 36, 41, 49–50, 55–7, 61–5, 67,
 77, 80, 99–100, 164, 169, 189 n. 79,
 213, 233–46, 270, 273, 327, 331–6, 343
 Seven Sages 290, 314 n. 30
 sexual outspokenness 96–7
 shark 199, 208
 shipwreck 165 n. 60, 181 n. 29, 183, 194–6,
 198 n. 15, 206–8

 Sicyon 26
Simias of Rhodes 11 n. 64, 77, 124 n. 18,
 291–3
 Simoni, Renato 134
Simonides (see also *Sylloge Simonidea*) 3, 92,
 124, 154–5, 158, 160–2, 165, 167–8,
 173, 185–6, 214, 217, 225–6, 276–7,
 279, 283 n. 49, 290 n. 14, 326
 Skepticism 302–4
 skolion (σκόλιον) 38–9 table 3.1 nos. 10 and
 16, 39–40
 skoptic epigram *see* mockery and epigram,
 satirical/skoptic
 slave 88, 122, 125, 152 n. 51, 203, 225, 240–1,
 242 n. 24, 293, 300
 runaway 237–40
 Smyrna 131, 143 n. 18, 160
 Socrates 202, 204 n. 32, 289 nn. 3 and 6,
 300, 303
 Socrates Scholasticus 329
 soldiers *see* military
Solon 86, 97, 314 n. 30
Sophocles 151 n. 47, 221 n. 29, 254 n. 19
 Antigone 89
 Women of Trachis 126
Sophronius (the Patriarch) 158
 Sosias 122–3
 Soterichus 157–9, 171
 soul (ψυχή) 15, 68–9, 178–9, 192, 202–6,
 208–9, 238–9, 241, 300 and n. 57,
 302–4
 Spartans 1, 38 table 3.1.5, 43, 45 n. 49,
 58 n. 39, 148, 161, 164–6,
 173–4, 283
 Sphinx 132–3
 sphragis 63, 74, 140
Spinario *see* *Thorn-Puller*
Stephanus of Byzantium 351
Stephanus Grammaticus 80
 Stoics 131 n. 46, 178 n. 11, 187, 294 n. 32,
 297–8, 299 n. 52
Strato 11 n. 64, 74, 75 n. 33, 259 n. 47, 319
Strato (of New Comedy) 44
Suetonius 130, 342
 Susa 160 n. 29, 194
 Susiana 166
 Syene (Aswan) 46, 48
Sylloge Simonidea (see also Simonides) 4,
 155, 168
 sympatheia (συμπάθεια) 179–80 and n. 23,
 181 n. 29, 184–5, 187
 symposium/symposia 2 n. 5, 7–9, 35 and n. 2,
 36, 39–40, 96, 104, 120–3, 215 n. 11
 aide-memoire 35, 38–9 table 3.1 nos. 10
 and 16, 39
 sympotic epigram *see* epigram, sympotic

- Symphosius/Symposium** 123, 130 n. 43,
132 n. 50
Syria 156, 166, 169 n. 87, 172 and n. 101, 238
Syrianus 68–70, 75
Syros 147–8
- Tacitus** 340
Taras (Tarentum) 111–12
Tatwine 130 n. 43
Tauron 38 table 3.1.11, 40, 169
tears 14, 149, 180 n. 24, 183 n. 43, 184–6,
188–90, 194, 236, 238–40, 242 n. 24,
263–4, 338
Technitai 160, 168–9
technopaegnon/technopaegnia 7 n. 50, 53,
77–8, 120
Teias 131 n. 47
Temenidae 223
Terenouthis 168 n. 83
Terminus 131
Thales 314 n. 30
Thallus of Miletus 61 table 4.1
Theaetetus Scholasticus 278–82
Thebes 22, 38 table 3.1.3, 45 n. 49, 162,
223, 282
Thebes in Phthiotis 165
Themistocles 161, 283, 285–6, 293
Theocritus 11 n. 64, 74 n. 30, 86–7, 89 n. 18,
91 n. 23, 94, 96–7, 146, 147 n. 36,
148, 154–5, 190, 236 n. 8, 241 n. 20,
245, 273
Syrinx 130
Theocritus of Chios 299–301
Theodore Syncellus 351
Theodoridas 11 n. 64, 42, 165–6
Theodosius I 324
Theodosius II 284 n. 54
Theognis/Theognidean *Sylloge* 8, 9 n. 57,
74 n. 32, 96 n. 45, 141, 171, 290 n. 14
Theophilus (Bishop of Alexandria) 324, 329
Theophrastus 99, 234 n. 6
Theopompus 301 n. 61
Theotokos *see* Mary (the Virgin Mary)
Thermon 5
Thermopylae 1, 165
Thermos 167
Thersites 79
Theseus 113–14, 117
Thessaly 165 and n. 62, 299 n. 53
Thessalonica 114 n. 37
Thetis 186
Thorn-Puller 312–17, 319
Thrace 165, 206
Thucydides 4, 81–2
- Thyillus** 214, 218–21, 229–30, 232
Thyreion 166
Tiberias 158 n. 17
Tiberius 61, 130
tomb-dovecote/Grabturm-Taubenschlag 169,
171–3
tragedy 88–90, 100 and n. 61, 123, 141, 148–9,
152 n. 49, 165, 168, 172, 179, 183–4,
216, 219, 236, 253–4, 255 n. 27,
302 n. 65, 338
transmission 13–14, 66–7, 69–73
Troy 63, 93 n. 33, 125, 152 nn. 49–50, 318
Tullius Geminus 161
Turandot (Persian princess) 133–4
Tyche 266 n. 72, 325 n. 4, 331–6
Tyndareus 267 n. 75
Tyrtaeus 86, 92, 155
Tzetzes, Isaac 81
- ugly people** 308, 310–11, 317–19
- variation** 7, 13–15, 30 n. 64, 40–1, 49, 53–5,
57–62, 85–7, 95, 98, 100–1, 103,
107–18, 142, 165, 170, 197–9, 201,
209, 213–14, 223, 228–9, 277, 280,
285, 302, 309–10, 318, 320, 330–1,
338, 345–7
- Varro (Marcus Terentius)** 131, 227–8,
229 n. 47, 232
Satires 227–8, 232
- Venice** 133
Venus 320, 321 fig. 18.4, 322 fig. 18.5
Vergil 15, 104 n. 5, 235–6, 245–6, 297 n. 47,
302 n. 65
- Verres** 336–7
visual humour 312–15, 317, 319
visualization 29–30, 186, 317, 319, 322–3
voice 3, 20, 22–4, 26, 40, 70, 138, 141,
143, 152–3, 166, 172–3, 184, 229,
233–4, 294 n. 33, 296, 304, 324,
342–4, 347
- Weimar** 133–4
wine 7–8, 62–3, 88–9, 95, 104–5, 109, 115,
130, 144, 220, 297–8, 331, 348–9
Wissmann, Jessica 36, 41–2, 47
wonder 139, 142, 147 n. 36, 235, 255, 301, 337
wordplay 14, 30, 79, 128–32, 255, 263–5,
335 n. 41
- Xanthias** 122
Xenophanes 40
Xenophon 67, 69, 234, 337
Xerxes 33

- Zamaspes 160
Zeno 203–4, 294 n. 35, 297–8
Zenon 38 table 3.1.11, 40, 44, 49, 169
Zeus 61, 126, 130, 151, 225, 249–58, 296, 318,
335 n. 40, 336–42
 affairs 15, 249–50, 255, 259, 265
 and Danae 15, 249–71
 and Ganymedes 249, 255, 259,
 265, 269
 transformations 249–58, 261–7
Zephyr 98
Zorava 171–2

Index Locorum

Literary sources, inscriptions, papyri, ostraca

LITERARY SOURCES

For epigrams cited as part of a list or a sequence, only *AP* and *APL* references are provided.

Aceratus

AP 7.138 = *FGE* 1 161

Adaeus

AP 6.228 = *GPh* 1 95

AP 6.258 = *GPh* 2 95

AP 7.238 = *GPh* 4 161

AP 7.240 = *GPh* 5 161

AP 10.20 = *GPh* 10 100

Aelius Theon

p. 118.7 Spengel 342 n. 14

Aemilianus of Nicaea

AP 7.623 63

AP 9.218 = *GPh* 2 61 table 4.1

Aeschylus

Ag. 1389–90 151 n. 47

Pr. 1043–53 250

[Aeschylus]

AP 7.255 162 n. 36

Agathias

AP 4.3 75 n. 34

AP 4.3.35 118

AP 5.273.2, 8 267 n. 76

AP 5.280.8 267 n. 76

AP 5.294 267 n. 76

AP 5.299.5 267 n. 76

AP 6.41 30 n. 66, 349 n. 36

AP 6.72 349 n. 36

AP 6.79 349 n. 36

AP 6.167 349 n. 36

AP 7.204 207–8

AP 7.552 6 n. 41, 193 n. 6

AP 7.583 209 n. 40

AP 9.641 281 n. 41

AP 9.665 343–4, 346–9

AP 11.345 203 n. 29, 289 n. 3

AP 11.350 342 n. 13

AP 11.352 290 n. 13, 342 n. 13

AP 11.354 290 n. 13, 292 n. 19, 304 n. 77,
342 n. 13

AP 11.365 342 n. 13

AP 11.372 342 n. 13

AP 11.376 342 n. 13

AP 11.379 342 n. 13

AP 11.382 342 n. 13

Agathon

TrGF 1.39 F 6 335 n. 41

Alcaeus

fr. 327.1 V 235

fr. 374 V 95

Alcaeus of Messene

AP 5.10 = *HE* 6 96

AP 6.218 = *HE* 21 217, 226–7, 230

AP 7.55 = *HE* 12 99

AP 7.247 = *HE* 4 86 n. 6, 162 n. 36

AP 7.429 = *HE* 16 21, 26 n. 42

AP 9.518 = *HE* 1 86 n. 6

AP 9.519 = *HE* 2 86 n. 6

AP 11.12 = *HE* 3 86 n. 6

APL 5 = *HE* 5 86 n. 6

APL 196 = *HE* 19 242, 328 n. 18

APL 226 = *HE* 20 95

Aldhelm of Malmesbury

Riddles 63 130 n. 43

86 130 n. 43

Alexis

Apokoptomenos fr. 20 K–A 234

Phaedrus fr. 247 K–A 234

Alpheius of Mitylene

AP 7.237 161

Ammianus

AP 11.102 311–12, 315, 317–19

AP 11.226 209 n. 40

Ammonides

AP 11.201 317–19

Anacreon

fr. 396 L–P 298 n. 51

PMG 413 96, 331, 335 n. 42

[Anacreon]

AP 7.160 = *FGE* 2 163

AP 7.226 = *FGE* 1 = *GV* 915 163,

185 n. 52

AP 9.715 7, 25 n. 39

AP 9.716 7, 25 n. 39

Anacreontea

4 330 n. 27

5.14 330 n. 27

11 241 n. 19, 330 n. 27

Anon.

- AP 5.2.1–2 260
 AP 5.65 259 n. 49
 AP 5.101 = *FGE* 6 260 n. 52
 AP 6.21 30 n. 66
 AP 6.22 30 n. 66
 AP 6.23 = *FGE* 17 24 n. 35
 AP 6.42 24 n. 35
 AP 6.45 = *HE* 43 32 n. 69
 AP 6.51 = *HE* 42 218–21, 229–30
 AP 6.51.9–10 = *HE* 42.9–10 220 n. 25
 AP 6.283 = *HE* 39 260 nn. 50 and 52
 AP 7.61 67 n. 4, 204 n. 30, 293 n. 27
 AP 7.61.1–2 = *FGE* 1.1–2 203, 302 n. 68
 AP 7.62 67 n. 4, 293 n. 27
 AP 7.62.3–4 302 n. 68
 AP 7.64 294 n. 35
 AP 7.83 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 AP 7.84 55 n. 27, 204 n. 34,
 290 nn. 11 and 13
 AP 7.86 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 AP 7.90 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 AP 7.93 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77
 AP 7.94 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 AP 7.119 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77
 AP 7.125 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 AP 7.128 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 AP 7.131 55 n. 27, 161, 290 n. 11
 AP 7.132 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 AP 7.134 290 n. 11
 AP 7.142 161
 AP 7.143 161
 AP 7.144 158, 161
 AP 7.148 161
 AP 7.152 161
 AP 7.228 171–3
 AP 7.257 162 n. 36
 AP 7.298 162 n. 36
 AP 7.334 = *SGO* 08/01/41 152 n. 50
 AP 7.431 166 n. 74
 AP 7.449 161
 AP 7.626 63
 AP 7.678 157–8, 171
 AP 7.699 = *GPh* 2 62 n. 53
 AP 9.48 = *FGE* 67 249–50
 AP 9.157 = *FGE* 85 245
 AP 9.191 82
 AP 9.358 68–70, 75, 303 n. 70
 AP 9.583 81–2
 AP 9.666 343 n. 17, 348
 AP 9.698 343 n. 16
 AP 9.704 174
 AP 9.713 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.714 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.721a 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.725 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.726 7, 25 n. 39, 310 n. 14
 AP 9.727 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.729 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.731 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.733 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.735 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.736 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.737 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 9.741 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 AP 9.806 350–2
 AP 9.807 350 n. 39
 AP 9.820 343–4, 346
 AP 9.821 343 n. 16
 AP 11.52 239 n. 12
 AP 11.149 309 n. 12
 AP 11.151 309 n. 12
 AP 11.213 309
 AP 11.250 310–11
 AP 11.260 130 n. 43
 AP 11.335 277 n. 25
 AP 11.337 130 n. 43
 AP 11.416 260
 AP 12.69 = *HE* 21 259
 AP 12.116 = *HE* 34 88 n. 12
 AP 14.6 125 n. 25
 AP 14.9 124, 125 n. 25
 AP 14.16 130 n. 45
 AP 14.23 121 n. 10
 AP 14.25 126 n. 28
 AP 14.26 121 n. 10
 AP 14.27 126 n. 28
 AP 14.28 121
 AP 14.30 121 n. 10
 AP 14.31 130–1
 AP 14.32 126
 AP 14.36 121 n. 10
 AP 14.38 126 n. 28
 AP 14.47 121 n. 10
 AP 14.52 121 n. 10
 AP 14.59 126 n. 28
 AP 14.64 132
 AP 14.105 125 n. 25, 128, 130
 AP 14.106 5 n. 34, 128 n. 36
 AP 15.1 77
 AP 15.4 = *GV* 1999 170 n. 91
 AP 15.5 = *GV* 1999 170 n. 91
 AP 15.6 = *GV* 1999 170 n. 91
 AP 15.7 = *GV* 1999 170 n. 91
 AP 15.8 = *GV* 1999 170 n. 91
 AP 15.23 77
APL 46 286
APL 62 284–5
APL 63 284–5
APL 72 281 n. 41
APL 83.1–2 310 n. 14
APL 84.1 310

Anon. (*cont.*)

- APl* 159.1 318 n. 39
APl 162 = *FGE* 82 319
APl 162.2 = *FGE* 82.2 318 n. 39
APl 168 318 n. 39
APl 175.2 309 n. 11
APl 194 329 n. 19
APl 202 242 n. 23
APl 223 277 n. 27
APl 263 = *FGE* 71 277 n. 27
APl 298 80
APl 300 80
APl 302 80
APl 304 80
APl 318 309 n. 12
APl 326 304 n. 77
APl 352.1 309 n. 11
CGFP 289 a = *PCG* VII 1072 44
CGFP 289 b = *PCG* VII 1073 44
Couigny III 169.5–6 310 n. 18
FGE 126 167 n. 78
FGE 155 288–9
GLP 141 285–6
SH 957 38 table 3.1.14
SH 958 276, 281
SH 969 276, 281
SH 971 43 n. 43
SH 972 42 n. 33
SH 973 38 table 3.1.7, 41–3, 45 n. 49
SH 975 = *FGE* 97 38 table 3.1.9, 43
SH 976 43
SH 977 38 table 3.1.11, 39–41, 44, 169
SH 978 38 table 3.1.2, 39, 44–8
SH 979 38 table 3.1.2, 39, 44–9
SH 980 38 table 3.1.13, 42–3
SH 984 38 table 3.1.15
SH 997 38 table 3.1.12
SH 1191 38–9 table 3.1.16, 39–40
- Antagoras
AP 7.103 = *HE* 1 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 292 n. 19
 CA 1 p. 120 = *D.L.* 4.26–7 237
- Antigonus of Carystus
AP 9.406 = *GPh* 1 63 n. 58
- Antipater of Sidon
AP 6.46 = *HE* 2 32 n. 69
AP 6.47 = *HE* 43 24 n. 35
AP 6.160 = *HE* 4 28 n. 53, 30 n. 66
AP 6.174 = *HE* 5 28 n. 53
AP 6.219 = *HE* 64 217, 227, 229–30
AP 7.2 = *HE* 8 67
AP 7.146 161
AP 7.161 = *HE* 20 161
AP 7.209 = *HE* 57 7 n. 45
AP 7.218 = *HE* 4 7 n. 46
- AP* 7.246 162 n. 36
AP 7.252 162 n. 36
AP 7.413 294 n. 35
AP 7.423 = *HE* 28 26 n. 42
AP 7.424 26 n. 42
AP 7.425 26 n. 42
AP 7.426 = *HE* 31 26 n. 42, 165
AP 7.427 26 n. 42
AP 7.464 = *HE* 53 20 n. 6
AP 7.625 63
AP 9.323 = *HE* 60 24 n. 37
AP 9.720 7, 25 n. 39
AP 9.721 7, 25 n. 39
AP 9.722 7, 25 n. 39
AP 9.723 7, 25 n. 39
AP 9.724 = *HE* 40 7, 25
AP 10.2 = *HE* 41 98 n. 56
APl 178.5–6 = *HE* 45.5–6 318
APl 197 242
HE 35 294 n. 35
HE 42 = *I. Délos* 2549 27 and nn. 48–9
HE 42.6–7 28 n. 56
- Antipater of Thessalonica
AP 5.3 = *GPh* 7 58 n. 39
AP 5.30 = *GPh* 6 261
AP 5.30.3–4 = *GPh* 6.3–4 268 n. 80
AP 5.31 = *GPh* 112 256 n. 31, 260–3, 266, 268, 271
AP 5.31.5–6 = *GPh* 112.5–6 253
AP 5.31.6 = *GPh* 112.6 254, 264 n. 68
AP 5.109 = *GPh* 53 266
AP 6.109 = *GPh* 54 27 n. 47, 30 n. 66, 31
AP 6.109.9–10 = *GPh* 54.9–10 31–2
AP 6.291 105
AP 7.65 = *GPh* 77 62 n. 55, 294 n. 35, 295–6
AP 7.136 = *GPh* 55 63 n. 62, 161
AP 7.185 = *GPh* 16 6 n. 41, 193 n. 6
AP 7.236 161
AP 7.286 = *GPh* 14 194 n. 11
AP 7.287 = *GPh* 58 194 n. 11
AP 7.288 = *GPh* 60 200, 205
AP 7.367 = *GPh* 63 6 n. 41, 63
AP 7.369 63
AP 7.390 = *GPh* 62 63, 193 n. 6
AP 7.398 = *GPh* 65 63, 193 n. 6
AP 7.402 63
AP 7.531 = *GPh* 23 58 n. 39, 161
AP 7.629 63
AP 7.637 63
AP 7.639 63
AP 7.640 63
AP 9.10 = *GPh* 18 198 n. 16
AP 9.10.1–2 = *GPh* 18. 1–2 198 n. 17
AP 9.46 = *GPh* 104 93 n. 32
AP 9.92 = *GPh* 2 116–17
AP 9.149 = *GPh* 68 92–3

- AP 9.231 = *GPh* 35 63 n. 58
 AP 9.241 = *GPh* 52 264 n. 69
 AP 9.241.4 = *GPh* 52.4 263 n. 63, 264 n. 66
 AP 9.305 = *GPh* 36 116 n. 40
 AP 9.309 = *GPh* 64 92 n. 29
 AP 9.407 = *GPh* 34 92 n. 29
 AP 9.420.3 = *GPh* 51.3 263
 AP 9.428 = *GPh* 1 114 n. 37
 AP 9.728 = *GPh* 84 7, 25 n. 39
 AP 10.25 = *GPh* 40 98
 AP 11.20 = *GPh* 20 115–16
 AP 11.20.2 = *GPh* 20.2 317 n. 38
 AP 11.23 = *GPh* 38 63 n. 60, 116 n. 40
 AP 11.24 = *GPh* 3 63 n. 60, 99, 114 n. 37
 AP 11.158 = *GPh* 97 62 n. 55, 294–5
 AP 11.224 = *GPh* 99 319
- Antiphanes (comic poet)
 fr. 194.1–5 K–A = 7 and 8 Cougny
 127–8
 fr. 194.27–31 K–A 128 n. 33
- Antiphanes of Macedon
 AP 9.245 = *GPh* 3 92 n. 29
 AP 9.258 = *GPh* 5 58–9
 AP 9.409 = *GPh* 6 100 n. 63
 AP 10.100 = *GPh* 7 100 n. 63
 AP 11.168 = *GPh* 8 100 n. 63
 AP 11.322.2 = *GPh* 9.2 317 n. 38
- Antiphrilos of Byzantium
 AP 5.308 = *GPh* 14 89
 AP 5.308.4 = *GPh* 14.4 267 n. 76
 AP 6.95 = *GPh* 15 30 n. 66, 95
 AP 6.97.1–2 = *GPh* 21.1–2 22
 AP 7.141 = *GPh* 23 63, 161
 AP 7.175 = *GPh* 24 58 n. 39
 AP 7.176 = *GPh* 25 6 n. 41, 58 n. 39
 AP 7.375 63
 AP 7.379 63
 AP 7.399 63
 AP 7.622 = *GPh* 18 63, 95
 AP 7.630 63
 AP 7.634 63
 AP 7.635 63
 AP 7.641 63
 AP 9.14 = *GPh* 30 57–8, 61 and
 table 4.1, 198
 AP 9.14.7–8 = *GPh* 30.7–8 62 n. 50
 AP 9.73 299, 301
 AP 9.86 = *GPh* 34 93 n. 31
 AP 9.222 = *GPh* 37 60, 61 and table 4.1,
 62, 197–8
 AP 9.310 = *GPh* 41 93 n. 31
 AP 9.404 = *GPh* 42 63 n. 58
 AP 10.17 = *GPh* 11 98
APL 333 = *GPh* 45 62 n. 55
APL 334 = *GPh* 46 62 n. 55
- Antistius
 AP 6.237 = *GPh* 1 217, 227
 AP 6.237.5–6 = *GPh* 1.5–6 225 n. 37
 AP 7.366 63
- Anyte
 AP 7.190 = *HE* 20 7 n. 45
 AP 7.208 = *HE* 9 164
 AP 7.215 = *HE* 12 198 n. 15
 AP 7.232 = *HE* 21 = *SGO* 04/25/01 163–4
 AP 7.486 = *HE* 5 89 n. 19
 AP 7.490 = *HE* 6 89 n. 19
 AP 7.646 = *HE* 7 89 n. 19
 AP 7.649 = *HE* 8 89 n. 19
 AP 7.724 = *HE* 4 163
 AP 7.724.3 = *HE* 4.3 174
 AP 7.724.3–4 = *HE* 4.3–4 155, 171, 173
APL 291 = *HE* 3 94
- Aphthonius
 Prog. vol. 10, p. 36.2 Rabe^b 342 n. 14
- Apollodorus mythographus
 Bibl. 2.5.11 258 n. 40
 3.14.4 131 n. 47
 3.26–7 264 n. 65
- Apollonides
 AP 7.233 = *GPh* 20 59–60
 AP 7.378 63
 AP 7.389 = *GPh* 6 63, 93 n. 29
 AP 7.631 = *GPh* 7 63, 196 n. 13
 AP 7.642 63
 AP 7.702 = *GPh* 12 199 n. 18
 AP 9.228 = *GPh* 14 93 n. 32
 AP 9.244 = *GPh* 16 93 n. 31
 AP 9.257 = *GPh* 17 58–9
 AP 9.265 = *GPh* 19 62
- Apollonius Rhodius
 Argon. 1.695 164 n. 57
 1.721–68 91 n. 23
 1.937 172 n. 102
 1.1134–48 217
 1.1253–60 148
 2.857 156 n. 11
 3.83–166 234
 3.95–7 242
 3.275–98 234
- Apuleius
 Met. 2.17 320 n. 49
 6.7–8 238
- Arabius Scholasticus
 AP 9.667 343–4, 348–9
APL 314 342 n. 13
- Aratus
 Phaen. 783–7 68 n. 6
 1058 172 n. 102

Archias

- AP 6.39 = *GPh* 8 28 n. 53
 AP 7.68 = *GPh* 14 62 n. 55, 294 n. 35
 AP 7.147 = *GPh* 16 93, 161
 AP 7.191 = *GPh* 20 63 n. 58
 AP 7.278 = *GPh* 12 194 n. 11
 AP 9.343 = *GPh* 24 63 n. 58
APL 179.2 = *GPh* 34.2 318 n. 39

Archilochus

- fr. 13 W 185, 187
 fr. 196a W 96
 fr. 196a.42 W 97
 fr. 196a.52 W 97

Ariston

- AP 6.303 105–8, 110, 114–15
 AP 6.306 30 n. 66

Ariston of Ceos

- Erotic Comparisons* frs 17–24 Wehrli 6
 234 n. 6

Ariston, son of Goras

- SGO* 12/03/03 = *IK Estremo oriente*
 214 160 n. 29

Aristophanes

- Ec.* 1169–74 289 n. 3
Lys. 456–7 289 n. 3
Nu. 1079–82 252
Pl. 782 79 n. 53
Ra. 966 289 n. 3
Th. 1079 79 n. 53
V. 15–19 122
 20–3 123
 fr. 545 K–A 132 n. 51

Aristophon

- Pythagoristes* fr. 11 K–A 234, 242

Aristotle

- de An.* 403a2–b19 178 n. 12
 432a15–3b30 178 n. 12
 432b29–3a3 178 n. 12
 [*Ep.*]4.4 335 n. 44
Erotica/Eroticus frs.1.15.95–8 Rose 234 n. 6
EN 3.2 300 n. 56
 6.2 300 n. 56
Metaph. 982b 301 n. 64
Po. 1457a6 131 n. 46
 1457b6–33 179 n. 21
 1459a4–8 179 n. 21
Rh. 1358b13–15 179 n. 18
 1378a20–3 178
 1404b5–5a10 179 n. 20
 1404b26–5a10 179 n. 21
 1408a19–25 180 n. 23
 1410b9–36 179 n. 21
 1411b22–12a10 179 n. 20
 1417a36–b7 188 n. 69
 [*Rh. AL.*] 1435a35 131 n. 46

Asclepiades

- AP 5.64 = *HE* 11 95, 249–53, 255–6,
 258, 260, 262 n. 59, 263, 264 n. 64,
 265–6, 268
 AP 5.145 = *HE* 12 95, 250 n. 2
 AP 5.164 = *HE* 13 95
 AP 5.167 = *HE* 14 95, 250 n. 2
 AP 5.181 = *HE* 25 88
 AP 5.185 = *HE* 26 88
 AP 5.189 = *HE* 42 95
 AP 7.145 161
 AP 7.500 = *HE* 31 165 n. 60, 194 n. 11,
 195 n. 12, 204 n. 34
 AP 9.64 = *HE* 45 99
 AP 12.46 = *HE* 15 5
 AP 12.153 = *HE* 19 96
APL 68 = *HE* 39 26 n. 45, 182 n. 34, 309 n. 11

Asclepiades of Tragilus

- Tragoudoumena FGrHist* 12F7a 132

Athenaeus

- 2.49c–d 132 n. 51
 3.125c–d 35 n. 2
 4.162a 288
 8.344f = *Hedylus HE* 8 249–50, 254 n. 19,
 256–9, 263
 10.436d 162 n. 39
 10.442e 162 n. 39
 10.450e–1b 127
 10.453b 122
 10.453b–c 121–2
 10.454f 162 n. 38
 10.456b 132 n. 51
 10.457b–c 124
 11.497d = *Hedylus HE* 4 40 n. 23
 13.593b–d 257 n. 37

Augustine of Hippo

- De civ. D.* 7.24 227

Aulus Gellius

- NA* 2.18.9 240 n. 18
 12.6 131 n. 48

Ausonius

- Bissula* 5 Green 308 n. 7
Epigr. 22 Green 277 n. 27
 45 Green 309 n. 12
 46 Green 309 n. 12
 47 Green 309 n. 12
 51 Green 309 n. 12

Automedon

- AP 11.46 = *GPh* 1 63 n. 58
 AP 11.50 = *GPh* 4 298–9

Bacchylides

- 13.31 Irigoin 185

Basil Megalomytes

- 11 Boissonade = 54 Cougny = 110
 Milovanović 129 n. 38

- 12 Boissonade = 55 Cougny = 112
 Milovanović 129
 36 Boissonade = 56 Cougny 129
 39 Boissonade = 26 Milovanović 127–8
- Bassus**
 AP 5.125 = *GPh* 1 260, 264–6, 270
 AP 7.243 = *GPh* 2 162 n. 36, 283
 AP 7.372 = *GPh* 3 63, 193 n. 6
 AP 7.386 = *GPh* 4 63
 AP 7.391 63
- Besantinus**
 AP 15.25 77
- Bianor**
 AP 7.387 63
 AP 7.388 = *GPh* 3 62 n. 53, 63, 197
 AP 7.396 63
 AP 7.644 = *GPh* 4 63, 93 n. 29
 AP 9.223 = *GPh* 7 60, 61 and table 4.1, 62
 AP 9.227 = *GPh* 8 57–8, 61 and table 4.1, 198 n. 16
 AP 9.227.7–8 = *GPh* 8.7–8 62 n. 50
- Callimachus**
Aet. fr. 1 74
 fr. 1.5 223
 fr. 1.7 Pf. 115
 fr. 1.13–14 Pf. 98 n. 53
 fr. 1.29–36 Pf. 116 n. 41
 fr. 1.33–4 Pf. 298 n. 48
 fr. 1.37–8 Pf. 157
 fr. 1.39–40 116 n. 41
 frs 25e–31b Pf. 92 n. 27
 frs 54–60 Pf. 90 n. 22
 fr. 54c Pf. 93 n. 31
 fr. 64 Pf. 90 n. 22, 173
 fr. 75.54–77 Pf. 100 n. 63
 frs 102–102a Pf. 92 n. 27
 fr. 110 Pf. 90 n. 22, 282
 fr. 114 Pf. 90 n. 22
 fr. 178.12 Pf. 104
- Epigr.*
 AP 5.23 = *HE* 63 95
 AP 6.147.3–4 = *HE* 24.3–4 22
 AP 6.148 = *HE* 16 23 n. 27
 AP 6.149 = *HE* 25 23
 AP 6.301 = *HE* 28 105–8, 110, 114
 AP 6.310 = *HE* 26 23
 AP 6.311 = *HE* 27 23 n. 27
 AP 6.347 = *HE* 21 24 n. 36
 AP 6.351 = *HE* 22 24
 AP 7.80 = *HE* 34 148, 183, 189 n. 77, 204
 AP 7.89 = *HE* 54 55 n. 27, 86 n. 3, 104, 290 n. 11
 AP 7.170 14, 92 n. 28, 142
 AP 7.271 = *HE* 45 195, 199
 AP 7.272 = *HE* 38 194 n. 11
 AP 7.277 = *HE* 50 194 n. 11
- AP 7.277.3 = *HE* 50.3 183 n. 41
 AP 7.447 = *HE* 35 22 n. 21
 AP 7.451 = *HE* 1231–2 142 n. 14, 166 n. 74
 AP 7.460 = *HE* 47 209 n. 40
 AP 7.471 = *HE* 53 290 n. 12, 291, 292 n. 19, 302–4
 AP 7.517 = *HE* 32 89, 90 n. 20, 92, 183 n. 37, 188 n. 69
 AP 7.518 = *HE* 36 94
 AP 7.519 = *HE* 44 183 n. 37
 AP 7.520 = *HE* 33 194 n. 9
 AP 7.521 = *HE* 1237–40 148
 AP 7.522 = *HE* 40 20, 182
 AP 7.725 = *HE* 42 89 n. 14
 AP 9.507 = *HE* 56 68, 70, 99
 AP 9.507.3 = *HE* 56.3 69
 AP 9.565 = *HE* 57 222 n. 32
 AP 9.566 = *HE* 58 222 n. 32
 AP 11.362 = *HE* 59 222 n. 32
 AP 12.43 = *HE* 4 117, 239
 AP 12.118 = *HE* 8 95, 299 n. 52
 AP 13.10 = *HE* 69 98
 fr. 393 Pf. = *HE* 64 86 n. 3
 fr. 398 Pf. 311
 fr. 400 Pf. = *HE* 69 86 n. 3
- Hecale* fr. 263 Hollis 113
- Hymni*
Ap. 108–12 104
 110–12 99 n. 59
 112 115
Lav.Pall. 44 157
- Iambi*
 3, fr. 193 Pf. 104–5
 3, fr. 193 Pf., 34–6 217
 3, fr. 193 Pf., 35–6 223
 12, fr. 202 Pf. 105
- frs 414–28 Pf. 99
 fr. 505 Pf. 282
 fr. 506 Pf. 282
 fr. 761 Pf. 214, 230 n. 48
- Catullus**
 1 74
 13 109 n. 24
 61.224–5 309 n. 13
 63 15, 213, 228–32
- Cephalas**
 AP 5.1 76–7
- Cercidas**
 CA fr. 1 295 n. 39
- Charito**
 2.11.1 309 n. 13
- Choricus of Gaza**
 18 Foerster/Richtsteig = *Declamationes*
 4 277 n. 29

Christodorus of Thebes

AP 2.16 290 n. 13

AP 2.131 290 n. 13

Chronicon Paschale

714.17–20 Dindorf 352 and n. 48

725 Dindorf 351 and n. 47

Chrysippus

SVF fr. 147 131 n. 46

Cicero

Arch. 18 9 n. 55*De or.* 2.216–90 323 n. 56

3.194 9 n. 55

Tusc. 5.89 109 n. 25*Verr.* 2.4.94–5 336–7

Cleanthes

On Love SVF 1.481 234 n. 6

Clearchus of Soli

Erotica frs 21–35 Wehrli 3 234 n. 6

Clement of Alexandria

Paed. 3.3.16.1 240 n. 18

Cleobulus of Lindos

AP 14.101 133

Cometas

AP 15.37 69–70, 79 n. 50

AP 15.40 79

AP 15.40.6–9 202 n. 21

Comic *adespota*

1062.9–12 K–A 256

Cornelius Longus

AP 6.191 24 n. 35

AP 117 = FGE 2 277, 279

Crates of Thebes (the Cynic)

Ep. 34 240 n. 18

Cratinus

fr. 66 PCG 214 n. 3

Crinagoras

AP 6.229 = GPh 4 32 n. 69

AP 6.232 30 n. 66

AP 6.242 = GPh 9 24 n. 35

AP 6.253 = GPh 43 24 n. 35

AP 7.371 63

AP 7.376 = GPh 16 63, 193 n. 6

AP 7.380 63

AP 7.401 = GPh 41 63, 209 n. 40

AP 7.628 = GPh 17 63, 209 n. 40

AP 7.633 63

AP 7.636 63

AP 7.638 63

AP 7.643 63

AP 7.645 63

AP 7.741 = GPh 21 277 n. 25

AP 9.224 = GPh 23 61 and table 4.1

AP 9.234 = GPh 48 63 n. 58

AP 9.545 = GPh 11 113–15, 117

AP 9.559 = GPh 32 98 n. 56, 111–13

AP 10.24 = GPh 34 98

AP 199 = GPh 50 57, 242

AP 199.7 = GPh 50.7 236

Cyrillus

AP 9.369 = FGE p. 115 2 n. 6

Damagetus

AP 6.277 = HE 1 166 n. 74

AP 7.231 = HE 4 86 n. 6, 164, 166 and n. 74

AP 7.432 = HE 3 166 n. 74

AP 7.438 = HE 5 86 n. 6, 164, 166 and n. 74

AP 7.497 = HE 9 194 n. 11

AP 7.540 = HE 7 164–5

AP 7.541 = HE 6 86 n. 6, 164–5

AP 1 = HE 11 166

AP 195 = HE 12 166 n. 74

Damocharis

AP 6.63 30 n. 66

Demetrius of Bithynia

AP 9.730 7, 25 n. 39

Democritus

AP 180.5–6 = FGE 1.5–6 318

Demosthenes

De cor. 289 167 n. 78

Dicaeogenes

TrGF fr. 1b.1 239 n. 12

Diocles of Carystus

AP 7.393 = GPh 1 63, 196–7, 208 n. 39

Diodorus of Sardes

AP 6.243 = GPh 3 24 n. 35

AP 7.74 = GPh 14 161

AP 7.370 63

AP 7.624 63

AP 7.627 = GPh 6 63–4

AP 7.632 = GPh 7 63, 209 n. 40

AP 9.219 = GPh 1 61 and table 4.1

Diodorus Siculus

4.2.1 264 n. 65

5.52.1 264 n. 65

28.3.10 335 n. 44

36.13 215 n. 7

Diodorus of Tarsus

AP 7.235 161

Diodorus / Zonas

AP 7.365 63

AP 7.404 63

AP 9.226 = GPh 6 61 and table 4.1, 63 n. 58

AP 9.556 = GPh 8 95

Diogenes the Athenian

TrGF 45F1.1–4 216

Diogenes Bishop of Amisus

AP 7.613 193 n. 6

Diogenes Laertius

1.90–1 133 n. 55

2.58 67

3.45–6 67 and n. 4

4.26–7 237

5.5 300 n. 58

6.29 240

6.30 240 n. 17

7.29 294 n. 35

7.151 187 n. 65

AP 7.85 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13

AP 7.87 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13

AP 7.88 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.91 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.92 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.95 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13

AP 7.96 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13

AP 7.97 55 n. 27, 67, 69, 290 n. 11

AP 7.98 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.101 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13

AP 7.102 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13

AP 7.104 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13

AP 7.105 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13

AP 7.106 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.107 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.108 55 n. 27, 67 n. 4, 290 n. 11

AP 7.109 55 n. 27, 67 n. 4, 290 n. 11

AP 7.110 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.111 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.112 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.113 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.114 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.115 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.116 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.118 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.121 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77

AP 7.122 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77

AP 7.123 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.124 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.126 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.127 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.129 55 n. 27, 203–4, 290 n. 11

AP 7.130 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

AP 7.133 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

Dionysius of Cyzicus

AP 7.78 = HE 1 193 n. 6

Dioscorides

AP 5.54 = HE 7 9, 100

AP 5.55 = HE 5 9, 96–7

AP 6.126 = HE 15 86 n. 6

AP 6.220 = HE 16 217, 223–5, 226 n. 40,
228–9

AP 6.290 = HE 14 105

AP 7.37 = HE 22 99, 221 n. 29

AP 7.166 = HE 39 20 n. 6

AP 7.167 = HE 40 20 n. 6

AP 7.229 = HE 30 161, 173

AP 7.351 = HE 17 86 n. 6

AP 7.410 = HE 20 99

AP 7.411 = HE 21 99

AP 7.434 = HE 32 161

AP 7.707 = HE 23 99

AP 7.708 = HE 24 99

AP 9.340 = HE 35 218, 222

AP 9.734 7, 25 n. 39

AP 11.195 = HE 36 218, 222–3

AP 12.37 = HE 10 259

AP 12.37.2 = HE 10.2 245 n. 28

AP 12.171 = HE 11 98

Diotimus

AP 5.106 = GPh 1 89

AP 7.227 = HE 2 164, 173

AP 7.227.2 = HE 2.2 157

Dosiadas

AP 15.26 77

Elias of Alexandria

In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium

p. 133 Busse 68 n. 7

Ephippus

Busiris fr. 2 K–A 256

Epicharmus

fr. 147 K–A 132 n. 51

Epicurus

Ep. 3 p. 65 U 335 n. 44

fr. 51 Arrighetti 110 n. 27

Eratosthenes Scholasticus

AP 6.78 30 n. 66

Euphorion

AP 7.651 = HE 2 194 n. 11

CA fr. 38 = 42 Lightfoot 276

Erycius

AP 6.234 = GPh 10 218–21, 229–30, 232

AP 6.255 = GPh 5 95

AP 7.174 = GPh 7 95

AP 7.230 = GPh 12 58 n. 39, 161

AP 7.368 63

AP 7.377 63

AP 7.397 = GPh 8 63, 194 n. 11,
196 n. 14

AP 9.558 = GPh 3 95

Etruscus of Messene

AP 7.381 63

Eubulus

Danae fr. 22 K–A 264

Kampylion fr. 40 K–A 234

Euenus

- AP 9.122 = *GPh* 5 63 n. 58
 AP 9.717 = *GPh* 8 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 AP 9.718 = *GPh* 9 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
APl 165 = *GPh* 10 58 n. 39, 318
APl 166 = *GPh* 11 58 n. 39

Euripides

- Alc.* 1081 183 n. 43
Ba. 431 296 n. 42
 455–6 219
Hel. 1302–52 216 n. 15
HF 1355–7 338
Hipp. 28 235
 989 296 n. 42
 1437–8 142 n. 15
IA 461 185 n. 52
 1109 185 n. 52
Ion 834 296 n. 42
IT 369 185 n. 52
Med. 5–12 45 n. 49
 985 185 n. 52
Ph. 496 296 n. 42
 529–34 44
Tr. 1130–1 183 n. 43
 1188–91 152 n. 49
Andromeda TrGF 138a 235
Archelaus TrGF 228.9–10 254 n. 19
Danae fr. 237 Nauck 165 n. 68
 fr. 324 Nauck 253
Ino fr. 410 Nauck 44–5
Oedipus TrGF 540a 132
Syleus TrGF 686a.94 240 n. 16

Eusebius

- PE* 6.8.22 335 n. 44
 15.2 299 n. 54
 15.793 299 n. 54

Eustathius Macrembolites

- Riddles* 4.4 131–2

Eutolmius Scholasticus

- AP* 6.86 30 n. 66

Gaetulicus

- AP* 6.190 24 n. 35
AP 7.244 162 n. 36
AP 7.245 162 n. 36
AP 7.275 = *FGE* 6 194 n. 11, 199 n. 18

Galen

- In Hippocratis aphorismos commentarii*
 VII, vol.18.1 Kühn, p. 35, l. 4 187 n. 65

Gregory of Nazianzus

- AP* 8.129 190
AP 8.189.1 190 n. 83
AP 8.206 190 n. 83
AP 8.249.1–2 190 n. 83
carmen 1.2.31 = *PG* 37.910–15 78–9

Hedylus

- AP* 6.292 = *HE* 1 105
HE 4 = Athenaeus 11.497d 40 n. 23
HE 8 = Athenaeus 8.344f 249–50,
 254 n. 19, 256–9, 263

Hegesippus

- AP* 6.124 = *HE* 1 28 n. 58
AP 7.276 = *HE* 7 200–1
AP 7.446 = *HE* 4 194
AP 13.12 = *HE* 6 196

Heliodorus

- Aeth.* 3.2.3–3.1 140 n. 7

Heraclides of Sinope

- AP* 7.392 = *GPh* 2 63, 194 n. 11

Heraclitus of Halicarnassus

- AP* 7.465 = *HE* 1 19–20

Herodas

- 4.20–5 32

Herodes Atticus

- SEG* 23.121 64 n. 65

Herodotus

- 1.155 335 n. 43
 1.166 241 n. 21
 5.59 1 n. 2
 6.105–6 273 n. 2
 7.228 1 nn. 2–3, 283

Hesiod

- fr. 129.14 M–W 257 n. 36
 fr. 135 M–W 257 n. 36
 fr. 240.1 M–W 172 n. 102
Op. 109–201 261
Th. 26–8 301 n. 60
 120 233
 122–3 269
 192–6 262

Hesychius of Miletus

- Patria* 1.25 Berger 351 and n. 42

Homer

- Il.* 1.3–4 156
 1.250–2 262
 1.357 156
 2.213 79
 2.219 79
 2.700–1 64
 2.814 192 n. 1
 3.64 261 n. 55
 3.442 269 n. 83
 4.240 156
 5.344 293 n. 28
 5.345 185 n. 55
 5.387–91 38 table 3.1.4, 39
 5.427 261 n. 55
 5.488 156

- 5.613 172 n. 102
 6.235–6 252
 6.330 156
 6.357–9 156 n. 6
 6.413 156
 7.89 192 n. 1
 9.389 261 n. 55
 11.403 338 n. 47
 13.327 293 n. 28
 14.198–9 269 n. 81
 14.294 269 n. 83
 14.312 265 n. 71
 14.315–16 269
 14.319 257
 15.174 348 n. 33
 15.189–93 259
 15.201 348 n. 33
 16.34–5 245
 16.66 185 n. 55
 16.454–7 154 n. 1
 17.90 338 n. 47
 17.151 156 n. 9
 17.272–3 156 n. 9
 17.591 186
 18.22–7 186
 19.282 261 n. 55
 19.301–2 183 n. 41
 19.337–8 183 n. 41
 21.552 338 n. 47
 22.59–65 151
 22.61 152
 22.98 338 n. 47
 22.305–6 156 n. 6
 22.437–61 149–50
 22.470 261 n. 55
 23.188 185 n. 55
 23.331 192 n. 1
 24.94 186
 24.527 335 n. 40
 24.699 261 n. 55
 24.707–8 185 n. 54
 24.789 185 n. 54

Od. 1.1–4 112
 1.8 112
 1.75 112
 3.244–6 262
 3.271 156 n. 9
 4.14 261 n. 55
 4.417–18 258
 4.455–8 258 n. 39
 4.583–4 154 n. 1
 5.116–24 44–5
 5.464 338
 5.473 156 n. 9
 7.223 151
 7.248 151

 8.83–92 189
 8.337 261 n. 55
 8.342 261 n. 55
 8.521–3 184 n. 44
 8.521–31 189
 9.528 348 n. 33
 10.552 145 n. 26
 11.61–5 144–5
 12.405 185 n. 55
 14.303 185 n. 55
 15.480 156 n. 9
 17.37 261 n. 55
 19.54 261 n. 55
 23.243–4 293 n. 28
 24.83–4 154 n. 1
 24.93–4 156 n. 6

 Homeric Hymns
 h. Cer. 145–50
 3 145
 8 145
 16 148
 19 145
 20 145
 33–7 145
 39 145
 41 145
 42 186
 44 145
 44–6 150
 57 145
 67 145
 81 145
 98–104 145 n. 31
 182–3 186 n. 59
 319 186 n. 59
 360 186 n. 59
 374 186 n. 59
 406–33 145
 418–23 145 n. 28
 h. Ven. 1–5 269 n. 81
 h. 22 (Poseidon) 6 348 n. 33

 Honestus of Corinth
 AP 7.66 = *GPh* 2 62 n. 55, 294 n. 35,
 295 n. 37
 AP 7.274 = *GPh* 22 194 n. 11, 199 n. 18
 AP 9.225 = *GPh* 4 61 and table 4.1, 63 n. 58
 AP 9.230 = *GPh* 5 63 n. 58
 AP 9.292 = *GPh* 7 207
 AP 11.45 = *GPh* 9 63 n. 58

 Horace
 Carm. 1.1 74
 3.16.1–11 260 n. 51

 Ibycus
 PMG 286 96
 PMGF 287.3–4 239 n. 12

Ignatius

AP 15.30 204 n. 30

Ion of Samos

CEG 819.5–6, 13 2 n. 8

Isaac Argyros

Milovanović 77 132–3

Isidorus of Aegae

AP 9.94 = *GPh* 5 198 n. 16

Isidorus Scholasticus

AP 6.58 30 n. 66

Isocrates

10.59 254 n. 19, 265 n. 70

Joannes Barbocallus

APl 327 292 n. 19

John Geometres

26 van Opstall 2008 72

123 van Opstall 2008 72 n. 23, 79

John Lydus

Mag. 3.28 Schamp 284

Mens. 4.132 333

John Tzetzes

Chil. 5.11.500–4 327 n. 17

Julian (the Emperor)

Ep. 98.32–8 Bidez 347 n. 28

Or. 5.159a 214 n. 5

Julian Antecessor

AP 11.367 342 n. 13

AP 11.368 342 n. 13

AP 11.369 342 n. 13

Julian of Egypt

AP 6.12 24 n. 35

AP 6.18 24 n. 35

AP 6.19 24 n. 35

AP 6.25 349 n. 36

AP 6.26 349 n. 36

AP 6.28 30 n. 66, 349 n. 36

AP 6.29 349 n. 36

AP 6.67 30 n. 66

AP 7.591 194–5 n. 11, 196 n. 14

AP 7.592 194–5 n. 11

AP 9.738 7, 25 n. 39

AP 9.739 7, 25 n. 39

AP 9.793 25 n. 39

AP 9.794 25 n. 39

AP 9.795 25 n. 39

AP 9.796 25 n. 39

AP 9.797 25 n. 39

AP 9.798 25 n. 39

APl 181.5–6 318

APl 325 290 n. 13, 304 n. 77

Juvenal

Sat. 10.58–64 329

10.144–6 326 n. 11

Leo Philosphus

AP 15.12 290 n. 13, 292 n. 19

Leonidas of Alexandria

AP 6.324 = *FGE* 3 24 n. 37, 28

AP 11.213 309

AP 12.20 = *FGE* 39 259

Leonidas of Tarentum

AP 6.4 = *HE* 52 30 and n. 66, 31

AP 6.129 = *HE* 34 28 n. 54, 30 n. 66

AP 6.131 = *HE* 35 30 n. 66

AP 6.204 = *HE* 7 27, 30 n. 64

AP 6.205 = *HE* 8 29–30

AP 6.211 = *HE* 2 30 n. 66

AP 6.221 = *HE* 53 225

AP 6.281 = *HE* 44 218

AP 6.286.1–2 = *HE* 40.1–2 28 n. 55

AP 6.288 = *HE* 41 28 n. 53, 105, 107 n. 17

AP 6.289 = *HE* 42 28 n. 53, 105

AP 6.293 = *HE* 54 105

AP 6.296 = *HE* 1 30 n. 66, 105

AP 6.298 = *HE* 55 30 n. 66, 105

AP 6.300 = *HE* 36 24 n. 35, 105–8, 110, 114

AP 6.302 = *HE* 37 105–10, 112–17

AP 6.305 = *HE* 56 107

AP 7.13 = *HE* 98 90 n. 21

AP 7.19 = *HE* 57 90 n. 21

AP 7.35 = *HE* 99 90 n. 21

AP 7.163.3 = *HE* 70.3 156 n. 11

AP 7.273 = *HE* 62 195 n. 11, 199 n. 18

AP 7.283 = *HE* 63 194 n. 11

AP 7.295 = *HE* 20 107 n. 17

AP 7.408 = *HE* 58 90 n. 21

AP 7.422 = *HE* 22 26 n. 42

AP 7.448 = *HE* 12 161

AP 7.472.14 = *HE* 77.14 107

AP 7.504 = *HE* 66 199–202

AP 7.506 = *HE* 65 199–200, 205–6, 208 and n. 38

AP 7.652 = *HE* 15 195 n. 11

AP 7.654 = *HE* 16 195 n. 11

AP 7.655 = *HE* 17 116–17

AP 7.657 = *HE* 19 94

AP 7.661.3 166 n. 69

AP 7.662 89 n. 18

AP 7.665 = *HE* 17 196

AP 7.715 = *HE* 93 111–13, 193 n. 6, 204 n. 34

AP 9.24 = *HE* 30 80, 90 n. 21

AP 9.25 = *HE* 101 68 n. 6, 99 n. 58

AP 9.322 = *HE* 25 24 n. 37

AP 9.719 = *HE* 88 7, 25 n. 39

AP 12.20.2 = *FGE* 39.2 267 n. 76

APl 182.8–9 = *HE* 23.8–9 318–19

APl 307 = *HE* 90 90 n. 21

SH 976 43

- Leontius Scholasticus
 AP 7.149 161
 AP 7.150 161
 AP 16.285 269 n. 84
- Libanius
 Or. 11.235–51 Förster 347 n. 28
- Livy
 1.55 131
- Longus
 Daphnis and Chloe 2.4.4 236
 2.5.1 236
- Lucian
 DMort. 27.1 64
 Fug. 27–8 238
 Im. 6 311 n. 21, 320 n. 46
- Lucillius
 AP 9.572 75 n. 33
 AP 11.69 130 n. 43
 AP 11.75 = 7 *Fl*^b 309 n. 12
 AP 11.88 259
 AP 11.132 189 n. 79
 AP 11.133 189 n. 79
 AP 11.134 189 n. 79
 AP 11.135 189 n. 79
 AP 11.136 189 n. 79
 AP 11.137 = 46 *Fl*^b 144 n. 23, 189 n. 79
 AP 11.184 339–42, 352
 AP 11.185 342 n. 11
 AP 11.211 = 85 *Fl*^b 309 n. 12
 AP 11.215 = 88 *Fl*^b 309–10
 AP 11.233 = 91 *Fl*^b 309 n. 12
 AP 11.308 = 112 *Fl*^b 317 n. 37
 AP 11.312.4 = 116.4 *Fl*^b 188–9
 APL 163 318 n. 39
- Lucretius
 2.1–19 293 n. 30, 303 n. 71
 2.600–60 231–2
 2.632 231 n. 59
 3.1–30 293 n. 30
 5.1–2 293 n. 30
 5.1315 231 n. 59
- Lycophron
 Alex. 7 132
 1467–8 82
- Macedonius Consul
 AP 5.238 245 n. 29
 AP 5.240 268 n. 80
 AP 6.30 349 n. 36
 AP 6.40 24 n. 35, 349 n. 36
 AP 6.175.3 309 n. 11
 AP 6.176 30 n. 66
 AP 11.366 342 n. 13
 AP 11.370 342 n. 13
- AP* 11.374 342 n. 13
 AP 11.375 342 n. 13
 AP 11.380 342 n. 13
- Maecius
 AP 6.233 30 n. 66
 AP 9.403 = *GPh* 10 63 n. 58
 APL 198 = *GPh* 11 57, 242
- Marcus Argentarius
 AP 5.113 = *GPh* 9 268 n. 80
 AP 6.201 30 n. 66
 AP 7.364 = *GPh* 21 63 and n. 58
 AP 7.374 = *GPh* 19 63, 194 n. 11,
 196 n. 14
 AP 7.384 63
 AP 7.395 = *GPh* 20 63, 194 n. 11
 AP 7.403 63
 AP 9.161 = *GPh* 15 99
 AP 9.221 = *GPh* 35 61 and table 4.1
 AP 9.229 = *GPh* 24 63 n. 58
 AP 9.286 = *GPh* 16 58 n. 39
 AP 9.732 = *GPh* 36 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 AP 10.4 = *GPh* 28 98 n. 56
- Marianus Scholasticus
 AP 9.668 343 n. 17
 AP 9.669 343 n. 17
 APL 201 242 n. 23
- Marinus
 AP 9.196 77–8
 AP 9.197 77–8
- Martial
 1.24 294 n. 32
 1.96 294 n. 32
 2.36 294 n. 32
 3.81 225
 4.53 294 n. 32
 6.27.3–4 309 n. 13
 6.56 294 n. 32
 7.58 294 n. 32
 9.27 294 n. 32
 9.47 294 n. 32
 9.50 2 n. 6
 10.1 2 n. 6
 12.42 294 n. 32
 14.175 270
- Meleager
 AP 4.1 = *HE* 1 51–2, 75
 AP 5.176 = *HE* 6 8 n. 51, 15, 233–7, 244–6,
 298 n. 51, 327 n. 17
 AP 5.177 = *HE* 37 8 n. 51, 15, 88 n. 12,
 233–42, 244–6, 298 n. 51, 327 n. 17
 AP 5.178 = *HE* 38 8 n. 51, 15, 88 n. 12,
 233–7, 239–41, 244–6, 298 n. 51,
 327 n. 17

Meleager (*cont.*)

- AP 5.179 = HE 7 8 n. 51, 15, 233–7, 241–6,
298 n. 51, 327 n. 17
AP 5.180 = HE 8 8 n. 51, 15, 233–7,
242 n. 22, 244–6, 298 n. 51, 327 n. 17
AP 5.191 = HE 73 96
AP 5.192 = HE 57 130 n. 43
AP 5.197 = HE 23 265 n. 71
AP 5.212.4 = HE 10.4 243 n. 25
AP 5.212.5–6 = HE 10.5–6 243 n. 27
AP 6.163 = HE 120 24 n. 37
AP 7.182 = HE 123 6 n. 41
AP 7.196 = HE 13 116 n. 41
AP 7.417.4 = HE 2.4 240
AP 7.418.5–6 = HE 3.5–6 240
AP 7.421 26 n. 42
AP 7.428 = HE 122 26–7, 32
AP 7.461 = HE 124 209 n. 40
AP 7.535 = HE 126 95
AP 12.23 = HE 99 96
AP 12.52 = HE 81 98
AP 12.65 = HE 100 259
AP 12.101 = HE 103 242 n. 22
AP 12.117 = HE 19 88 n. 12, 252 n. 14
AP 12.158.3 = HE 93.3 166 n. 69
AP 12.167 = HE 109 96
AP 12.257 = HE 129 75

Menander

- AP 7.72 = FGE 1 293, 296
Dys. 643 144 n. 24
670 144
683–5 144
Georg. fr. 2 334 n. 38
Mis. 9–14 251
opus incertum CGFP 297 38 table 3.1.4, 39
Sam. 589–98 253–4, 271 n. 88
595 258
sententiae 740 Jaekel 335 n. 41

Menander Rhetor

- 2.11 Russell/Wilson 291 n. 18
2.418–22 Russell/Wilson 291 n. 18

Metiochus and Parthenope

- col. 2.46 Stephens/Winkler 236

Michael Psellus

- 47 Westerink = 13 Boissonade = 40
Cougny = 128 Milovanović 129 n. 38
50 Westerink = 16 Boissonade = 43
Cougny = 101 Milovanović 131–2

Mimnermus

- fr. 1 W 261 n. 55

Mnasalces

- AP 6.125 = HE 4 28 n. 58
AP 6.128 = HE 5 28 n. 58

- AP 6.264 = HE 6 28 n. 58
AP 7.54 = HE 18 99, 193 n. 6
AP 7.54.1 = HE 18.1 172 n. 102
AP 7.192 = HE 12 7 n. 45
AP 7.194 = HE 13 7 n. 45
AP 7.242 = HE 7 162 n. 36

Moschus

- 1 234, 236, 238–9
1.1 238
1.6 238
1.16–17 243 n. 26
1.24–9 238
1.25–7 236

Mucius Scaevola

- AP 9.217 = GPh 1 61 and table 4.1

Musaeus

- Hero and Leander* 198–201 269

Myrinus

- AP 6.108 = GPh 1 24 n. 35

Nicaenetus

- AP 6.225 = HE 1 24 n. 35

Nicander

- AP 7.435 161

Nicarchus

- AP 11.71 260 n. 50
AP 11.73 260 n. 50
AP 11.102 311–12, 315, 317–19
AP 11.328 259
AP 11.330 259 nn. 44 and 46
AP 11.407 259
P. Oxy. 66, no. 4502, vv. 30–7 132 n. 51
P. Oxy. 66, no. 4502, v. 42 258 n. 41

Nicephorus

- 8.33 280 n. 35

Nicias

- AP 7.200 = HE 4 7 n. 45

Nicomachus

- AP 7.299 162 n. 36

Nonnus

- D. 21.155 348
27.294–300 280–2
28.126–57 280–1

Nossis

- AP 6.265 = HE 3 24 n. 35
AP 7.718 = HE 11 90 n. 21, 96 n. 48
AP 9.332 = HE 4 260 n. 52

Oedipodea

- fr. 2* West 132 n. 51

Ovid

- Am. 1.1 236, 242
1.6 236
2.18 236

- 2.19.27–8 260 n. 51
 3.4.21–2 260 n. 51
 3.8 270–1
 3.8.29–34 260 n. 51, 270
Ars am. 3.401 320 n. 49
 3.554 239 n. 12
Fast. 4.457–8 150 n. 44
Met. 4.610–11 260 n. 51
 4.697–8 260 n. 51
 5.250 260 n. 51
 6.113 260 n. 51
 10.298–502 131 n. 47
 11.116–17 260 n. 51
Pont. 4.1.29–30 320 n. 49
Rem. am. 1–40 242
 699–702 242 n. 22
Tr. 2.527–8 320 n. 49
 Palladas of Alexandria
 AP 5.257 256 n. 31, 266–8
 AP 6.85 30 n. 66
 AP 9.127 = ep. 28 W p. 12, ll. 28–31 5
 AP 9.168 324
 AP 9.171 324
 AP 9.173 324
 AP 9.175 324
 AP 9.180 266 n. 72, 331–5
 AP 9.181 266 n. 72, 331–4
 AP 9.181.1 325 n. 4
 AP 9.182 266 n. 72, 331–4
 AP 9.183 266 n. 72, 331–6
 AP 9.379 = ep. 37 W p. 21, ll. 4–8 5
 AP 9.441 336–8
 AP 9.528 326–7
 AP 9.773 266 n. 72, 329–31, 335 n. 42
 AP 10.53 266 n. 72
 AP 10.82 324
 AP 10.89 324
 AP 10.90 324
 AP 11.54 330 n. 27
 AP 11.378 324
 APl 207 242 n. 23, 328
 APl 282 331 n. 29
 Pamphrepius
 fr. 4.39–40 Livrea 286
 Pancrates
 AP 6.117 30 n. 66
 Parmenion
 AP 5.33 = *GPh* 1 256 n. 31, 260, 261 n. 54,
 263–5, 271
 AP 5.34 = *GPh* 2 256 n. 31, 260, 261 n. 54,
 263–5
 AP 9.43 = *GPh* 6 63 n. 58, 116–17, 277 n. 26
 AP 9.114 = *GPh* 9 93 n. 32
 AP 9.342.1–2 = *GPh* 11.1–2 2 n. 6
 APl 222 = *GPh* 15 277, 279
 Paul the Silentiary
 AP 5.217 252 n. 11, 264 n. 64, 267–9
 AP 5.230 268 n. 79
 AP 5.234 346 n. 26
 AP 5.268 243 n. 27
 AP 5.272 346 n. 26
 AP 5.274.3–4 243 n. 25
 AP 5.275 268 n. 80
 AP 5.301 346 n. 26
 AP 6.64 30 n. 66
 AP 6.65 30 n. 66
 AP 6.66 30 n. 66
 AP 6.81 30 n. 66
 AP 6.84 28 n. 58
 AP 7.4 68–9
 AP 7.560 193 n. 6
 AP 9.663 343–5, 349
 AP 9.664 343–6, 349
 APl 118 278, 282, 285
Description of the Hagia Sophia 138 285
 Pausanias
 1.33.2 273 n. 2
 Perses
 AP 7.501 = *HE* 4 194 n. 11
 AP 7.539 = *HE* 9 195 n. 11
 Petronius
 Sat. 55.3 189
 55.4–6.7 189
 71.12–2.1 189
 73.2 189 n. 81
 97.1–2 238
 Phalaecus
 AP 6.165 30 n. 66
 Phantias
 AP 6.294 30 n. 66, 105
 AP 6.295 30 n. 66, 105
 AP 6.297 105
 AP 6.299 105
 AP 6.307 299 n. 53
 Pherecydes
FGrHist 3 F 10 254 n. 19, 262 n. 59
FGrHist 3 F 16a 258 n. 40
 Philetas of Samos
 AP 7.481 = *HE* 2 22 n. 21
 Philip of Thessalonica
 AP 4.2 = *GPh* 1 75 n. 34
 AP 4.2.1–4 = *GPh* 1.1–4 102
 AP 4.2.3–4 = *GPh* 1.3–4 51
 AP 4.2.5 = *GPh* 1.5 54
 AP 4.2.6 = *GPh* 1.6 2 n. 6, 54
 AP 6.5 30 n. 66
 AP 6.38 30 n. 66
 AP 6.62 30 n. 66

Philip of Thessalonica (*cont.*)

- AP 6.90 30 n. 66
 AP 6.92 30 n. 66
 AP 6.94 = *GPh* 14 30 n. 66, 218–21,
 229–30, 232
 AP 6.99 = *GPh* 15 99
 AP 6.101 30 n. 66
 AP 6.102 30 n. 66
 AP 6.103 = *GPh* 18 30 nn. 64 and 66
 AP 6.104 30 n. 66
 AP 6.203 = *GPh* 76 93 n. 32
 AP 6.247 = *GPh* 22 28 n. 53, 30 n. 66
 AP 6.251 = *GPh* 7 24 n. 35
 AP 7.186 6 n. 41
 AP 7.234 = *GPh* 31 59–60
 AP 7.362 = *GPh* 78 205, 208 n. 38
 AP 7.382 = *GPh* 25 63, 194 n. 11
 AP 7.382.5 = *GPh* 25.5 196 n. 14
 AP 7.383 = *GPh* 32 63, 205–6
 AP 7.385 = *GPh* 33 63–5, 161
 AP 7.394 63
 AP 7.405 = *GPh* 34 63
 AP 7.554 = *GPh* 27 209 n. 40
 AP 9.22 = *GPh* 36 93
 AP 9.56 = *GPh* 37 206–7, 208 n. 38
 AP 9.232 = *GPh* 42 63 n. 58
 AP 9.267 = *GPh* 30 62 n. 53
 AP 9.742 = *GPh* 79 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 AP 11.347.2 = *GPh* 61.2 317 n. 38
 AP 115 = *GPh* 74 245 n. 29

Philo of Alexandria (Judaeus)

- De providentia* fr. 2.34.4 335 n. 44
De vita contemplativa 7.2–5 330 n. 26
Quod omnis probus liber sit 121–4
 240 n. 18

Philochorus

- FGrHist* 328 T 6 4 n. 29

Philodemus

- AP 5.46 = *GPh* 4 89
 AP 5.308.4 267 n. 76
 AP 6.251 = *GPh* 7 98
 AP 7.222 = *GPh* 26 218, 229 n. 47
 AP 11.35 = *GPh* 22 89
 AP 11.41 = *GPh* 17 298 n. 51
 AP 11.44 = *GPh* 23 108–10, 113–15, 117
De Pietate 812–19 Obbink 109 n. 24

Philostratus

- Her.* 12 64
Im. 1.14 264 n. 65

Photius

- Bibl.* 128.96b 73
 265.494b 72
Lex. β 61 214 n. 5
 μ 423 Theodorides 214 n. 5

Pindar

- Dith.* 2 F 70b 8–11 216 n. 15
N. 5 154
 5.1–5 171
 10.10–11 257 n. 36
O. 11.4 292 n. 22
 2.25–6 264 n. 65
P. 3.77–8 216 n. 18
 12.17–18 254 n. 19

Pinytus

- AP 7.16 = *GPh* 1 204

Pisander of Rhodes

- AP 7.304 161

Plato

- Alc.* 1.129a 296 n. 42
Ap. 20d–4b 292 n. 22
Lg. 641c 241 n. 21
 790d2–e4 215 n. 11
Men. 77b–78c 292 n. 23
Phd. 59c 303
 64c 202 n. 24
 89b–c 202 n. 24, 204 n. 32
 115d–16a 202–3
R. 533c7–d2 300
 607b5–6 290, 298 n. 50
Sph. 238c 301 n. 63
Smp. 174c 296 n. 42
 178b 238
Tht. 155d 301 n. 64
 169c1 235

[Plato]

- AP 7.99 = *FGE* 10 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11,
 292 n. 19
 AP 7.100 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 AP 7.256 162 n. 36
 AP 7.259 = *FGE* 11 162 n. 36, 194
 AP 9.506 = *FGE* 13 66–7, 69, 82
 AP 160.4 = *FGE* 23.4 318 n. 39, 319

Plautus

- Stich.* 218–33 240 n. 16
Trin. 237 239 n. 12

Pliny

- HN* 34.57 320 n. 49
 35.91 320
 36.20 320

Plutarch

- De glor. Ath.* 249b–c 283
De Is. et Os. 369c 335 n. 40
De soll. an. 978b5 185 n. 55
Dem. 30 72
Nic. 29 154

Polybius

- 4.6.9 164

- 4.7.2 164
 4.10.2 164
 4.25.4 164
 4.36.6 165
 4.61 164
 5.30.3 164
 29.21.5 335 n. 39
 Polystratus
 AP 7.297 162 n. 36
 Posidippus
 1 A-B 99
 2 A-B 99
 3 A-B 24 n. 35, 99
 4 A-B 99
 5 A-B 99
 6 A-B 99
 7 A-B 99
 8 A-B 99
 9 A-B 99
 10 A-B 99
 11 A-B 99
 12 A-B 99
 13 A-B 99
 14 A-B 99
 15 A-B = *HE* 20 5, 99
 16 A-B 99
 17 A-B 99
 18 A-B 99
 19 A-B 97 n. 51, 99
 20 A-B 99
 21 A-B 86, 97-9
 22 A-B 86, 97-9
 23 A-B 86, 99
 24 A-B 86, 99
 25 A-B 86, 99
 26 A-B 86, 99
 27 A-B 86, 99
 28 A-B 86, 99
 29 A-B 86, 99
 30 A-B 86, 99
 31 A-B 86, 99, 275
 32 A-B 86, 91, 99
 33 A-B 86, 91-2, 99
 34 A-B 86, 99
 35 A-B 86, 99, 275
 36 A-B 273
 38 A-B 24
 39 A-B 273
 39.2 A-B 22 n. 21
 42 A-B 167
 43 A-B 167
 44 A-B 167, 183 n. 37
 45 A-B 167
 46 A-B 167
 47 A-B 167
 48 A-B 167
 49 A-B 167
 50 A-B 89, 92, 167, 184-7
 51 A-B 167
 51.1-2 A-B 22 n. 21
 52 A-B 167
 53 A-B 167
 54 A-B 167
 55 A-B 167, 183 n. 37
 56 A-B 20 n. 6, 167
 57 A-B 167
 58 A-B 92, 167
 59 A-B 167
 60 A-B 167
 61 A-B 167, 209 n. 40
 63 A-B 32 n. 69
 65 A-B = *AP* 119 = *HE* 18 5, 274-5
 66 A-B 25 n. 39
 89 A-B 292 n. 19
 93 A-B 196, 209 n. 40
 94 A-B 195
 95 A-B 28 n. 59, 274
 96 A-B 28 n. 59
 97 A-B 28 n. 59
 98 A-B 28 n. 59
 99 A-B 28 n. 59
 100 A-B 28 n. 59
 101 A-B 28 n. 59, 274
 104.3 A-B 20
 105 A-B 22 n. 21
 106 A-B 22 n. 21
 115 A-B = *HE* 11 38 table 3.1.1, 39, 45,
 47, 169
 116 A-B = *HE* 12 38 table 3.1.1, 39, 45,
 47-8, 169
 118.24 A-B = *SH* 705.24 187
 121 A-B = *HE* 16 89
 123 A-B = *AP* 5.134 = *HE* 1 297-8
 124 A-B = *AP* 5.183 = *HE* 10 88
 130 A-B = *AP* 5.213 = *HE* 4 88 n. 12,
 95-6
 131 A-B = *AP* 7.170 = *HE* 21 14, 92,
 138 n. 3, 141-5, 147 n. 36, 152-3
 132 A-B = *AP* 7.267 = *HE* 15 196
 138 A-B = *AP* 12.120 = *HE* 7 298 n. 51
 141 A-B = *AP* 68 = *HE* 39 182 n. 34,
 309 n. 11
 142 A-B = *AP* 275 = *HE* 19 26 and n. 42
 Dubia 31-3, 5 167 and nn. 76-7
 Pratinas
 PMG 708.10-11 289 n. 3
 Proclus
 AP 7.341 290 n. 13, 292 n. 19
 Procopius
 Aed. 1.2.1-12 284 n. 54

- Procopius (*cont.*)
 1.11.16–17 343 n. 15
Pers. 1.13–14, 59–73 283 n. 51
- Propertius
 1.1 242 n. 22
 2.12 243–4
 2.20.9–12 260 n. 51
- Ps.-Hermogenes
Prog. 10 p. 122 Rabe^a 322 n. 54, 342 n. 14
- Ps.-Phocylides
 178 309 n. 13
- Quintilian
Inst. 6.3 323 n. 56
 8.2.13 123 n. 15
- Quintus Smyrnaeus
 5.69–72 320 n. 49
- Rhianus
AP 6.173 = *HE* 7 214, 218–22, 229, 232
AP 6.173.4 = *HE* 7.4 225
- Rufinus
AP 5.27 260
AP 5.28.4 267 n. 76
AP 5.92.2, 4 267 n. 76
- Sannyrion
Danae fr. 8.1–2 K–A 255
- Sappho
 fr. 5 V 97
 fr. 130 V 8
 fr. 130.1–2 L–P 298
- [Sappho]
AP 6.269.1–2 = *FGE* 1.1–2 23 n. 29
- Satyrus
AP 195 242–3
- Scholia
 in Aeschinem
 3.187 214 n. 5, 215 n. 6
 in Aristophanis *Plutum*
 431 214 n. 5
- Secundus of Tarentum
AP 214 = *GPh* 4 245 n. 29
- [Seneca]
Octavia 794–9 329 n. 22
- Septuagint*
 Jeremiah 22.10 190 n. 87
 Job 31.38 190 n. 87
- Serapion of Alexandria
AP 7.400 63
- Simias
AP 7.60 = *HE* 6 67 n. 4, 290 n. 12, 291–3
AP 7.60.2 = *HE* 6.2 295 n. 39
AP 15.22 77
- AP* 15.24 77
AP 15.27 77
- Simonides
PMG 581.5–6 326
- [Simonides]
AP 6.52 = *FGE* 61 28 n. 58
AP 6.217 = *HE* 2 214, 217, 225–6
AP 6.217.8 = *HE* 2.8 231
AP 7.248 = *FGE* 22(a) 1 n. 3,
 162 n. 36
AP 7.249 = *FGE* 22(b) 1 n. 3, 162 n. 36
AP 7.250 162 n. 36
AP 7.251 = *FGE* 9 162 n. 36,
 185–6
AP 7.253 162 n. 36
AP 7.254 162 n. 36
AP 7.254a 162 n. 36
AP 7.258 162 n. 36
AP 7.296 162 n. 36
AP 7.300 162 n. 36
AP 7.301 162 n. 36
AP 7.431 = *HE* 5 166 n. 74
AP 7.442 162 n. 36
AP 7.443 162 n. 36
AP 7.496 = *FGE* 68 195 n. 11
AP 7.677 = *FGE* 6 1 n. 3, 158
AP 23 = *FGE* 31 22 n. 19
AP 232 = *FGE* 5 277, 279
FGE 22b 148
FGE 88 35 n. 2
- Socrates
Historia ecclesiastica 5.16 329
- Solon
 fr. 19 W 97
- Sophocles
Ant. 816 185 n. 52
 891 89
 944–54 254 n. 19
 1238–9 151 n. 47
Tr. 1159–63 126
 1167 172 n. 102
- Sophronius (the Patriarch)
AP 7.679 158
- Sozomen
Hist. eccl. 2.5 280 n. 35
- [Speusippus]
AP 7.61 = *FGE* 1 (a) 67 n. 4, 204 n. 30,
 293 n. 27
AP 7.61.1–2 = *FGE* 1.1–2 (a) 203,
 302 n. 68
AP 31 = *FGE* 1 (b) 203 n. 25, 302 n. 68
- Statyllius Flaccus
AP 6.196 = *GPh* 2 32 n. 69

- Stephanus of Byzantium
Ethnica B 130 s.v. *Βόσπορος* Billerbeck
 351 and n. 43
- Stephanus Grammaticus
 AP 9.385 80
- Stobaeus
 4.41.28 334 n. 38
- Strabo
 7.3.3 64 n. 64
- Strato
 AP 12.1 74 n. 33
 AP 12.2 74 n. 33
 AP 12.207 = 48 Fl^b 319
 AP 12.239 256 n. 31, 259 n. 50, 264 n. 67
 AP 12.258 74 n. 33
- Strato Comicus
Phoenicides CGFP 219 = PCG VII Strato 44
- Suda
 s.v. *βάραθρον* (β 99 Adler) 214 n. 5
ἐπίγραμμα (ε 2270 Adler) 70 n. 12
Καδμεία νίκη (κ 17–18 Adler) 241 n. 21
Κόλουθος (κ 146 Adler) 284 n. 53
Πανύασις (π 248 Adler) 140 n. 7
Φιλόχορος (φ 441 Adler) 4
- Suetonius
Ner. 31.2 340 n. 2
 39 342 n. 11
Tib. 42 130
- Symmachus of Pellana
CEG 888.18–19 2 n. 8
- Symphosius
Aenigmata
 32 123
 36 130 n. 43
 74 130 n. 43
- Syrianus
 AP 9.358 68–70, 75, 303 n. 70
- Tacitus
Ann. 15.42 340 n. 2
 15.44 340 n. 6
- Terence
Eun. 583–93 260 n. 51
- Thallus of Miletus
 AP 7.373 63
 AP 9.220 = *GPh* 5 61 table 4.1
- Theaetetus Scholasticus
 AP 6.27 30 n. 66, 349 n. 36
APL 221 278–9, 281–2, 285
APL 223 278–9, 281–2, 285
- Theocritus
Epigr.
 AP 6.177 = *HE* 6 27 n. 47, 94
 AP 6.340 = *HE* 2 273
 AP 7.262 = *HE* 23 22 n. 21
 AP 7.658 = *HE* 7 209 n. 40
 AP 7.660 = *HE* 12 193 n. 6
 AP 7.661.3 = *HE* 10.3 166 n. 69
 AP 7.662 = *HE* 9 89 n. 18
 AP 9.338 = *HE* 19 94–5
 AP 9.432 = *HE* 22 94
 AP 9.433 = *HE* 21 94–5
 AP 9.434 74 n. 30
 AP 9.437 = *HE* 20 94–5
 AP 15.21 77, 130
HE 13 90 n. 21
HE 14 90 n. 21
HE 15 90 n. 21
HE 22 94
Id. 1 94, 190
 1.1–3 190
 1.27–56 91 n. 23
 1.72 190
 2 96
 3.14 252 n. 11
 3.15–16 236 n. 8
 3.15–17 245
 4 94
 4.50–7 312 n. 24
 7.52–89 97
 7.76–7 236 n. 8
 13 148
 13.53 147 n. 36
 15.79 311 n. 21
 15.101 261 n. 55
 16.42–59 154–5
 17.26–7 275 n. 14
 17.44 309 n. 13
 [20.11–15] 241 n. 20
 [20.36] 190 n. 85
 23.34 190 n. 85
 23.38 190 n. 85
 23.55 190 n. 85
 [27.17] 239 n. 12
- Theocritus of Chios
FGE 1 299–301
- Theodore Syncellus
Analecta avarica 304.6–7 Sternbach
 351 and n. 46
- Theodoridas
 AP 7.282 = *HE* 19 194 n. 11
 AP 7.529 = *HE* 10 165–6
 AP 7.722 = *HE* 11 165–6,
 193 n. 6
- Theodorus
 AP 11.198 342 n. 13

Theognis

- 19–26 74 n. 32
 237–54 171
 1381–5 261 n. 55

Theon Rhetor

- 109.24–6 Spengel 291 n. 18

Theophrastus

- frs 107–9 Wimmer 234 n. 6
 fr. 113 Wimmer 234 n. 6
 frs 114–15 Wimmer 234 n. 6

Thyillus

- AP 6.170 30 n. 66
 AP 7.223 = FGE 2 218–19, 229–30, 232

Tibullus

- 1.6.5 239 n. 12

Timon of Phlius

- SH 799 290 n. 12

Tragic *adespota*

- TrGF *adesp.* 2 F 179 335 n. 44
 TrGF *adesp.* 629 216

Tullius Geminus

- AP 7.73 = GPh 1 161
 AP 9.740 = GPh 5 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 AP 9.741 62 n. 54

Tullius Laureas

- AP 7.294 = GPh 2 199 n. 18

Tymnes

- AP 7.433 161

Varro

- Ling. fr. 55 131
 Sat. Men. fr. 19 Astbury 229 n. 47
 frs 119–20 Astbury 227 n. 43
 frs 131–3 Astbury 227 n. 43
 frs 149–50 Astbury 227 n. 43
 fr. 364 Astbury 228, 232

Vergil

- Aen. 8.359–69 104 n. 5
 Ecl. 8.43 245
 8.43–5 236 n. 8
 8.47 235, 245
 8.49–50 236

Xenophanes

- AP 7.120 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77
 fr. B 1 D–K 40

Xenophon

- Cyr. 3.1.17 296 n. 45
 5.1.1–18 234
 HG 3.4.17 331 n. 28
 Mem. 2.1.21–34 337

Zenodotus

- AP 7.117 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11

INSCRIPTIONS

- CEG 10 202 n. 21
 CEG 13 193 n. 4
 CEG 24 89 n. 19
 CEG 27 189 n. 75
 CEG 28 189 n. 75, 193 n. 4
 CEG 50 207 n. 37
 CEG 51 = IG I³ 1219 25
 CEG 82 140 n. 7
 CEG 84 207 n. 37
 CEG 97 188 n. 74
 CEG 98 205
 CEG 108 22 nn. 19 and 22, 139 nn. 5–6
 CEG 117 207 n. 37
 CEG 120 22 n. 19
 CEG 171 139 n. 5, 140 n. 7
 CEG 173 22 n. 22
 CEG 176 140 n. 7
 CEG 177 140 n. 7
 CEG 190 24 n. 32
 CEG 256 = IG I³ 784 33
 CEG 286 22 nn. 19 and 22
 CEG 326 22–4
 CEG 336 24 n. 32
 CEG 429 = SGO 01/12/05 22 nn. 19 and 22
 CEG 439 22 n. 22
 CEG 455 263 n. 61
 CEG 470 193 n. 4
 CEG 487 193
 CEG 509 139 n. 5
 CEG 513 207 n. 37
 CEG 518 139 n. 5, 140 n. 7, 207 n. 37
 CEG 524 139 n. 5, 140 n. 7
 CEG 529 207 n. 37
 CEG 532 22
 CEG 535 202 n. 21
 CEG 543 207 n. 37
 CEG 545 202 n. 21, 203 n. 26
 CEG 548 202 n. 21
 CEG 549 204 n. 31
 CEG 551 204 n. 31
 CEG 557 207 n. 37
 CEG 558 202 n. 21
 CEG 585 139 n. 5, 207 n. 37
 CEG 587 207 n. 37
 CEG 591 207 n. 37
 CEG 593 202 n. 21, 203 nn. 26–7, 204,
 207 n. 37
 CEG 596 26 n. 42
 CEG 604 207 n. 37
 CEG 611 204
 CEG 662 140 n. 7
 CEG 667 140 n. 7
 CEG 678 140 n. 7
 CEG 686 207 n. 37

- CEG 689 140 n. 7, 207 n. 37
 CEG 704 139 n. 5, 207 n. 37
 CEG 715 140 n. 7
 CEG 722 143
 CEG 737 202 n. 21
 CEG 786 26 n. 44
 CEG 791 26 n. 44
 CEG 794 26 n. 44
 CEG 819.5–6, 13 2 n. 8
 CEG 841 140 n. 7
 CEG 888.18–19 2 n. 8
 CIG 5127 = OGIS 54 275 n. 14
 CIL III 733 = IK 58.1 no. 15 = ILS 820
 333 n. 33
 EG 600 289 n. 6
 EG 931 282–3
 FD III 3.192 167
 GE 186 = GV 1466 = ISE 24 282
 GG 167 = GV 1155 152 n. 50
 GG 189 289 n. 6
 GG 201 289 n. 6
 GG 414 289 n. 6
 GG 459 = GV 1988 138 n. 4, 143
 GG 470 289 n. 6
 GV 119 152 n. 53
 GV 270 172 n. 97
 GV 569.18 = KILyk. I 306 = SEG 6.488 156 n. 6
 GV 632 143
 GV 647 142 n. 14
 GV 684 139
 GV 689 157 n. 14
 GV 734 139
 GV 745 139
 GV 874 = SGO 05/01/36 139, 151 n. 47
 GV 915 163
 GV 928 140 n. 7, 143
 GV 929 143
 GV 930 143
 GV 943 166
 GV 952 146 n. 33
 GV 969 = SGO 04/08/02 139
 GV 1038 139
 GV 1155 = GG 167 152 n. 50
 GV 1159 = SGO 03/05/04 14, 137–8, 140–6,
 147 n. 36, 148–53
 GV 1178 165 n. 66
 GV 1270 139, 143
 GV 1312 22 n. 21
 GV 1331 = SGO 04/21/03 139–40
 GV 1350 = SGO 07/06/05 152 n. 50
 GV 1451 289 n. 6
 GV 1465 163
 GV 1466 = GE 186 = ISE 24 282
 GV 1521 157 n. 14
 GV 1595 = IGUR III 1344 143, 146–7
 GV 1606 20 n. 6
 GV 1732 = SGO 14/13/05 147 n. 36
 GV 1733 157 n. 14
 GV 1765 = SGO 05/01/64 143 n. 18, 152 n. 50
 GV 1804 157 n. 14
 GV 1805 140 n. 7
 GV 1811 157 n. 14
 GV 1843 165 n. 67
 GV 1881 = SGO 04/02/11 20, 26
 GV 1981 170 n. 91
 GV 1982 170 n. 91
 GV 1988 = GG 459 138 n. 4, 143
 GV 1996 170 n. 91
 GV 1999 170 n. 91
 GV 2000 170 n. 91
 GV 2030 = IG XII.5.677 147–8
 I. Délos 298A.29 30 n. 63
 I. Délos 380.71–2 29 n. 60
 I. Délos 421.67 29 n. 60
 I. Délos 439a.39 29 n. 60
 I. Délos 442B.41 29 n. 60
 I. Délos 461Ba.47–8 29 n. 60
 I. Délos 1403BbI.61–2 28 n. 55
 I. Délos 1403BbI.83–4 28 n. 54
 I. Délos 1421Ab.15–16 30 n. 65
 I. Délos 1439AbcI.48–53 28 n. 57
 I. Délos 1441AI.67–70 28 n. 57
 I. Délos 1442A.52–3 28 nn. 52 and 56
 I. Délos 1442B.56 28 and n. 56
 I. Délos 1450A.48–50 28 n. 57
 I. Délos 2549 = HE 42 27 and nn. 48–9, 28 n. 56
 IG I³ 784 = CEG 256 33
 IG I³ 1219 = CEG 51 25
 IG IV².1 121.3–9 29 n. 60
 IG V.2 356.7 165
 IG IX.1 1064.1–2 156
 IG IX 1² 1.17.24 5, 167
 IG IX 1² 2.314 166
 IG IX.2 63 167 n. 78
 IG XI.2 287B.70 30 n. 63
 IG XII.5 308 156 n. 11
 IG XII.5 677 147–8
 IGLS 15 389 172 n. 98
 IGUR III 1149.7–8 156 n. 11
 IGUR III 1344 = GV 1595 146–7
 IGUR IV 1702 152 nn. 50–1
 IK Byzantion 1.15 = CIL III 733 = ILS 820
 333 n. 33
 IK Estremo oriente 187 166 n. 73
 IK Estremo oriente 214 = SGO 12/03/03
 160 n. 29
 IK Klaudiupolis 78.4 156 n. 6
 ILS 820 = IK 58.1 no. 15 = CIL III 733
 333 n. 33
 ISE 24 = GE 186 = GV 1466 282
 KILyk. I 306 = GV 569.18 156 n. 6
 OGIS 54 = CIG 5127 275 n. 14

SEG 6.488 = GV 569.18 = *KILyK*. I 306
156 n. 6

SEG 20.395 172 n. 98

SEG 23.121 64 n. 65

SEG 26.819 350 n. 40

SEG 42.498 166 n. 71

SEG 49.1976 166 n. 73

SEG 53.523 165

SEG 53.2.1780 166 n. 73

SGDI II 1441 167 n. 78

SGO 01/02/01 141 n. 11

SGO 01/06/01 165 n. 66

SGO 01/12/05 = CEG 429.1 22 n. 22

SGO 01/12/17 140 n. 7

SGO 01/20/15 292 n. 19

SGO 02/09/05 173–4

SGO 03/02/29 292 n. 19, 304 n. 77

SGO 03/05/04 = GV 1159 14, 137–8, 140–6,
147 n. 36, 148–53

SGO 04/02/11 = GV 1881 20, 26

SGO 04/08/02 = GV 969 139

SGO 04/21/03 = GV 1331 139–40

SGO 04/24/02 304 n. 77

SGO 04/25/01 163–4

SGO 05/01/35 160

SGO 05/01/36 = GV 874 139

SGO 05/01/64 = GV 1765 143 n. 18, 152 n. 50

SGO 07/06/05 = GV 1350 152 n. 50

SGO 08/01/35 304 n. 77

SGO 08/01/41 = AP 7.334 152 n. 50

SGO 08/06/10 142 n. 13

SGO 09/05/16 169 and n. 89, 170

SGO 10/02/28 159

SGO 11/13/02 157 and n. 12, 159 n. 22

SGO 12/03/03 = *IK Estremo oriente* 214
160 n. 29

SGO 12/03/99 166 n. 73

SGO 14/13/05 = GV 1732 147 n. 36

SGO 15/02/07 170 n. 91

SGO 16/04/04 158 n. 17

SGO 16/22/02 169 n. 85

SGO 17/17/01 157 n. 14

SGO 19/10/01 165

SGO 20/13/03 292 n. 19

SGO 21/05/01 159

SGO 21/06/01 158 n. 17

SGO 21/24/02 159 n. 22, 169 n. 87,
172 n. 100

SGO 22/14/02 169 n. 87, 172 n. 97

SGO 22/15/02 169 n. 87, 173 n. 103

SGO 22/21/01 173 n. 103

SGO 22/23/01 169 n. 87, 172

SGO 22/38/99 169 n. 87, 172 n. 100

SGO 22/39/01 172

SGO 22/42/08 169 n. 87

SGO 22/42/98 169 n. 87, 172 n. 100

SGO 22/42/99 169 n. 87, 172 n. 99

SGO 22/44/01 169 n. 87, 172 n. 100

SGO 22/44/02 169 n. 87, 172 n. 100

SGO 22/49/01 156

PAPYRI

Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum P. 13270 38
table 3.1.10, 39–40

P. Berol. inv. 4757 170 n. 93

P. Cairo Zen. 4 59532 38 table 3.1.11,
39–41, 44

P. CtYBR inv. 4000

ep. 12 p. 6, ll. 10–20 294 n. 35,
304 n. 77

p. 9, ll. 25–9 326

p. 9, ll. 30–3 326 n. 13

ep. 28 W p. 12, ll. 28–31 5

p. 12, ll. 32–4 326 n. 13

ep. 35 W p. 18, ll. 1–9 12 n. 69

ep. 37 W p. 21, ll. 4–8 5

P. Freib. (Sitz. Heid. Akad. 1914, 2) *I I b* 38
table 3.1.4, 39, 42 n. 33

P. Freib. I 4 42

P. Hamb. 118–19 90 n. 20

P. Herc. 1232 fr. 8 col. 1 = test. 16 109 n. 24

P. Klein. Form. 402 346 n. 27

P. Mich. I 77 40 n. 27

P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 48, 86–8, 167, 274

P. Oxy. 27, no. 2459 132 n. 51

P. Oxy. 66, no. 4502, vv. 30–7 132 n. 51

P. Oxy. LXVI 4502, v. 42 258 n. 41

P. Ryl. Gr. 3 499 38 table 3.1.8

Paris, Louvre 7171 + Paris, Louvre 7172

(*P. Firmin-Didot*) 38 table 3.1.1, 39,
45, 47

UPZ 1.121 238 n. 10

Vienna Epigrams Papyrus (*G 40611*)

col. i. 14 5

col. ii. 10 5 n. 34

OSTRACA

Eulimene 10–12 (2009–11), 135–55 39 table
3.1.17, 43 n. 40

O. Bodl. 2 2172 38 table 3.1.6, 43–4

2173 38 table 3.1.5, 43–4, 45 n. 49
2174 42 n. 33

O. Wilcken 2 1148 = *BKT* V 1, p. 78
170 n. 93

O. Wilcken 2 1488 38 table 3.1.3, 43

Anthologia Palatina

BOOK 2

- 2.16 290 n. 13
- 2.131 290 n. 13

BOOK 4

- 4.1 51–2, 75
- 4.2 75 n. 34
 - 4.2.1–4 102
 - 4.2.3–4 51
 - 4.2.5 54
 - 4.2.6 2 n. 6, 54
- 4.3 75 n. 34
 - 4.3.35 118

BOOK 5

- 5.1 76–7
- 5.2.1–2 260
- 5.3 58 n. 39
- 5.10 96
- 5.23 95
- 5.27 260
- 5.28.4 267 n. 76
- 5.30 261
 - 5.30.3–4 268 n. 80
- 5.31 256 n. 31, 260–3, 266, 268, 271
 - 5.31.5–6 253
 - 5.31.6 254, 264 n. 68
- 5.33 256 n. 31, 260, 261 n. 54, 263–5, 271
- 5.34 256 n. 31, 260, 261 n. 54, 263–5
- 5.46 89
- 5.54 9, 100
- 5.55 9, 96–7
- 5.64 95, 249–53, 255–6, 258, 260, 262 n.59, 263, 264 n. 64, 265–6, 268
- 5.65 259 n. 49
- 5.92.2, 4 267 n. 76
- 5.101 260 n. 52
- 5.106 89
- 5.109 266
- 5.113 268 n. 80
- 5.125 260, 264–6, 270
- 5.134 297–8
- 5.145 95, 250 n. 2
- 5.164 95
- 5.167 95, 250 n. 2
- 5.176 8 n. 51, 15, 233–7, 244–6, 298 n. 51, 327 n. 17
- 5.177 8 n. 51, 15, 88 n. 12, 233–42, 244–6, 298 n. 51, 327 n. 17

- 5.178 8 n. 51, 15, 88 n. 12, 233–7, 239–41, 244–6, 298 n. 51, 327 n. 17
- 5.179 8 n. 51, 15, 233–7, 241–6, 298 n. 51, 327 n. 17
- 5.180 8 n. 51, 15, 233–7, 242 n. 22, 244–6, 298 n. 51, 327 n. 17
- 5.181 88
- 5.183 88
- 5.185 88
- 5.189 95
- 5.191 96
- 5.192 130 n. 43
- 5.197 265 n. 71
- 5.212.4 243 n. 25
 - 5.212.5–6 243 n. 27
- 5.213 88 n. 12, 95–6
- 5.217 252 n. 11, 264 n. 64, 267–9
- 5.230 268 n. 79
- 5.234 346 n. 26
- 5.238 245 n. 29
- 5.240 268 n. 80
- 5.257 256 n. 31, 266–8
- 5.268 243 n. 27
- 5.272 346 n. 26
- 5.273.2, 8 267 n. 76
- 5.274.3–4 243 n. 25
- 5.275 268 n. 80
- 5.280.8 267 n. 76
- 5.294 267 n. 76
- 5.299.5 267 n. 76
- 5.301 346 n. 26
- 5.308 89
 - 5.308.4 267 n. 76

BOOK 6

- 6.4 30 and n. 66, 31
- 6.5 30 n. 66
- 6.12 24 n. 35
- 6.18 24 n. 35
- 6.19 24 n. 35
- 6.21 30 n. 66
- 6.22 30 n. 66
- 6.23 24 n. 35
- 6.25 349 n. 36
- 6.26 349 n. 36
- 6.27 30 n. 66, 349 n. 36
- 6.28 30 n. 66, 349 n. 36
- 6.29 349 n. 36
- 6.30 349 n. 36

Book 6 (*cont.*)

- 6.38 30 n. 66
 6.39 28 n. 53
 6.40 24 n. 35, 349 n. 36
 6.41 30 n. 66, 349 n. 36
 6.42 24 n. 35
 6.45 32 n. 69
 6.46 32 n. 69
 6.47 24 n. 35
 6.51 218–21, 229–30
 6.52 28 n. 58
 6.58 30 n. 66
 6.62 30 n. 66
 6.63 30 n. 66
 6.64 30 n. 66
 6.65 30 n. 66
 6.66 30 n. 66
 6.67 30 n. 66
 7.68 62 n. 55, 294 n. 35
 6.72 349 n. 36
 6.78 30 n. 66
 6.79 349 n. 36
 6.81 30 n. 66
 6.84 28 n. 58
 6.85 30 n. 66
 6.86 30 n. 66
 6.90 30 n. 66
 6.92 30 n. 66
 6.94 30 n. 66, 218–21, 229–30, 232
 6.95 30 n. 66, 95
 6.97.1–2 22
 6.99 99
 6.101 30 n. 66
 6.102 30 n. 66
 6.103 30 nn. 64 and 66
 6.104 30 n. 66
 6.108 24 n. 35
 6.109 27 n. 47, 30 n. 66, 31
 6.109.9–10 31–2
 6.117 30 n. 66
 6.124 28 n. 58
 6.125 28 n. 58
 6.126 86 n. 6
 6.128 28 n. 58
 6.129 28 n. 54, 30 n. 66
 6.131 30 n. 66
 6.147.3–4 22
 6.148 23 n. 27
 6.149 23
 6.160 28 n. 53, 30 n. 66
 6.163 24 n. 37
 6.165 30 n. 66
 6.167 349 n. 36
 6.170 30 n. 66
 6.173 214, 218–22, 229, 232
 6.173.4 225
 6.174 28 n. 53
 6.175.3 309 n. 11
 6.176 30 n. 66
 6.177 27 n. 47, 94
 6.190 24 n. 35
 6.191 24 n. 35
 6.196 32 n. 69
 6.201 30 n. 66
 6.203 93 n. 32
 6.204 27, 30 n. 64
 6.205 29–30
 6.211 30 n. 66
 6.217 214, 217, 225–6
 6.217.8 231
 6.218 217, 226–7, 230
 6.219 217, 227, 229–30
 6.220 217, 223–5, 226 n. 40,
 228–9
 6.221 225
 6.225 24 n. 35
 6.228 95
 6.229 32 n. 69
 6.232 30 n. 66
 6.233 30 n. 66
 6.234 218–21, 229–30, 232
 6.237 217, 227
 6.237.5–6 225 n. 37
 6.242 24 n. 35
 6.243 24 n. 35
 6.247 28 n. 53, 30 n. 66
 6.251 24 n. 35, 98
 6.253 24 n. 35
 6.255 95
 6.258 95
 6.264 28 n. 58
 6.265 24 n. 35
 6.269.1–2 23 n. 29
 6.277 166 n. 74
 6.281 218
 6.283 260 nn. 50 and 52
 6.286.1–2 28 n. 55
 6.288 28 n. 53, 105, 107 n. 17
 6.289 28 n. 53, 105
 6.290 105
 6.291 105
 6.292 105
 6.293 105
 6.294 30 n. 66, 105
 6.295 30 n. 66, 105
 6.296 30 n. 66, 105
 6.297 105
 6.298 30 n. 66, 105
 6.299 105
 6.300 24 n. 35, 105–8, 110, 114
 6.301 105–8, 110, 114
 6.302 105–10, 112–17
 6.303 105–8, 110, 114–15
 6.305 107

- 6.306 30 n. 66
 6.307 299 n. 53
 6.310 23
 6.311 23 n. 27
 6.324 24 n. 37, 28
 6.340 273
 6.347 24 n. 36
 6.351 24
- Book 7**
- 7.2 67
 7.4 68–9
 7.13 90 n. 21
 7.16 204
 7.19 90 n. 21
 7.35 90 n. 21
 7.37 99, 221 n. 29
 7.54 99, 193 n. 6
 7.54.1 172 n. 102
 7.55 99
 7.60 67 n. 4, 290 n. 12, 291–3
 7.60.2 295 n. 39
 7.61 67 n. 4, 204 n. 30, 293 n. 27
 7.61.1–2 203, 302 n. 68
 7.62 67 n. 4, 293 n. 27
 7.62.3–4 303 n. 68
 7.64 294 n. 35
 7.65 62 n. 55, 294 n. 35, 295–6
 7.66 62 n. 55, 294 n. 35, 295 n. 37
 7.73 161
 7.74 161
 7.78 193 n. 6
 7.80 148, 183, 189 n. 77, 204
 7.83 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 7.84 55 n. 27, 204 n. 34, 290 nn. 11
 and 13
 7.85 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 7.86 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 7.87 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 7.88 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.89 55 n. 27, 86 n. 3, 104, 290 n. 11
 7.90 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.91 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.92 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.93 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77
 7.94 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.95 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 7.96 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 7.97 55 n. 27, 67, 69, 290 n. 11
 7.98 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.99 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 292 n. 19
 7.100 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.101 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 7.102 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 7.103 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 292 n. 19
 7.104 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
 7.105 55 n. 27, 290 nn. 11 and 13
- 7.106 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.107 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.108 55 n. 27, 67 n. 4, 290 n. 11
 7.109 55 n. 27, 67 n. 4, 290 n. 11
 7.110 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.111 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.112 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.113 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.114 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.115 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.116 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.117 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.118 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.119 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77
 7.120 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77
 7.121 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77
 7.122 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11, 304 n. 77
 7.123 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.124 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.125 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.126 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.127 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.128 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.129 55 n. 27, 203–4, 290 n. 11
 7.130 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.131 55 n. 27, 161, 290 n. 11
 7.132 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.133 55 n. 27, 290 n. 11
 7.134 290 n. 11
 7.136 63 n. 62, 161
 7.138 161
 7.141 63, 161
 7.142 161
 7.143 161
 7.144 158, 161
 7.145 161
 7.146 161
 7.147 93, 161
 7.148 161
 7.149 161
 7.150 161
 7.152 161
 7.160 163
 7.161 161
 7.163.3 156 n. 11
 7.166 20 n. 6
 7.167 20 n. 6
 7.170 14, 92, 138 n. 3, 141–5,
 152–3
 7.170.5 147 n. 36
 7.174 95
 7.175 58 n. 39
 7.176 6 n. 41, 58 n. 39
 7.182 6 n. 41
 7.185 6 n. 41, 193 n. 6
 7.186 6 n. 41
 7.190 7 n. 45

Book 7 (*cont.*)

- 7.191 63 n. 58
 7.192 7 n. 45
 7.194 7 n. 45
 7.196 116 n. 41
 7.200 7 n. 45
 7.204 207–8
 7.208 164
 7.209 7 n. 45
 7.215 198 n. 15
 7.218 7 n. 46
 7.222 218, 229 n. 47
 7.226 163, 185 n. 52
 7.227 164, 173
 7.227.2 157
 7.228 171–3
 7.229 161, 173
 7.230 58 n. 39, 161
 7.231 86 n. 6, 164, 166 and n. 74
 7.232 163–4
 7.233 59–60
 7.234 59–60
 7.235 161
 7.236 161
 7.237 161
 7.238 161
 7.240 161
 7.242 162 n. 36
 7.243 162 n. 36, 283
 7.244 162 n. 36
 7.245 162 n. 36
 7.246 162 n. 36
 7.247 86 n. 6, 162 n. 36
 7.248 1 n. 3, 162 n. 36
 7.249 1 n. 3, 162 n. 36
 7.250 162 n. 36
 7.251 162 n. 36, 185–6
 7.252 162 n. 36
 7.253 162 n. 36
 7.254 162 n. 36
 7.254a 162 n. 36
 7.255 162 n. 36
 7.256 162 n. 36
 7.257 162 n. 36
 7.258 162 n. 36
 7.259 162 n. 36, 194
 7.262 22 n. 21
 7.267 196
 7.271 195, 199
 7.272 194 n. 11
 7.273 195 n. 11, 199 n. 18
 7.274 194 n. 11, 199 n. 18
 7.275 194 n. 11, 199 n. 18
 7.276 200–1
 7.277 194 n. 11
 7.277.3 183 n. 41
 7.278 194 n. 11
 7.282 194 n. 11
 7.283 194 n. 11
 7.286 194 n. 11
 7.287 194 n. 11
 7.288 200, 205
 7.294 199 n. 18
 7.295 107 n. 17
 7.296 162 n. 36
 7.297 162 n. 36
 7.298 162 n. 36
 7.299 162 n. 36
 7.300 162 n. 36
 7.301 162 n. 36
 7.304 161
 7.334 152 n. 50
 7.341 290 n. 13, 292 n. 19
 7.351 86 n. 6
 7.362 205, 208 n. 38
 7.364 63 and n. 58
 7.365 63
 7.366 63
 7.367 6 n. 41, 63
 7.368 63
 7.369 63
 7.370 63
 7.371 63
 7.372 63, 193 n. 6
 7.373 63
 7.374 63, 194 n. 11, 196 n. 14
 7.375 63
 7.376 63, 193 n. 6
 7.377 63
 7.378 63
 7.379 63
 7.380 63
 7.381 63
 7.382 63, 194 n. 11
 7.382.5 196 n. 14
 7.383 63, 205–6
 7.384 63
 7.385 63–5, 161
 7.386 63
 7.387 63
 7.388 62 n. 53, 63, 197
 7.389 63, 93 n. 29
 7.390 63, 193 n. 6
 7.391 63
 7.392 63, 194 n. 11
 7.393 63, 196–7, 208 n. 39
 7.394 63
 7.395 63, 194 n. 11
 7.396 63
 7.397 63, 194 n. 11, 196 n. 14
 7.398 63, 193 n. 6
 7.399 63

7.400 63	7.529 165–6
7.401 63, 209 n. 40	7.531 58 n. 39, 161
7.402 63	7.535 95
7.403 63	7.539 195 n. 11
7.404 63	7.540 164–5
7.405 63	7.541 86 n. 6, 164–5
7.408 90 n. 21	7.552 6 n. 41, 193 n. 6
7.410 99	7.554 209 n. 40
7.411 99	7.560 193 n. 6
7.413 294 n. 35	7.583 209 n. 40
7.417.4 240	7.591 194–5 n. 11, 196 n. 14
7.418.5–6 240	7.592 194–5 n. 11
7.421 26 n. 42	7.613 193 n. 6
7.422 26 n. 42	7.622 63, 95
7.423 26 n. 42	7.623 63
7.424 26 n. 42	7.624 63
7.425 26 n. 42	7.625 63
7.426 26 n. 42, 165	7.626 63
7.427 26 n. 42	7.627 63–4
7.428 26–7, 32	7.628 63, 209 n. 40
7.429 21, 26 n. 42	7.629 63
7.431 166 n. 74	7.630 63
7.433 161	7.631 63, 196 n. 13
7.434 161	7.632 63, 209 n. 40
7.435 161	7.633 63
7.438 86 n. 6, 164, 166 and n. 74	7.634 63
7.442 162 n. 36	7.635 63
7.443 162 n. 36	7.636 63
7.446 194	7.637 63
7.447 22 n. 21	7.638 63
7.448 161	7.639 63
7.449 161	7.640 63
7.451 142 n. 14, 166 n. 74	7.641 63
7.460 209 n. 40	7.642 63
7.461 209 n. 40	7.643 63
7.464 20 n. 6	7.644 63, 93 n. 29
7.465 19–20	7.645 63
7.471 290 n. 12, 291, 292 n. 19, 302–4	7.646 89 n. 19
7.472.14 107	7.649 89 n. 19
7.481 22 n. 21	7.651 194 n. 11
7.486 89 n. 19	7.652 195 n. 11
7.490 89 n. 19	7.654 195 n. 11
7.496 195 n. 11	7.655 116–17
7.497 194 n. 11	7.657 94
7.500 165 n. 60, 194 n. 11, 195 n. 12, 204 n. 34	7.658 209 n. 40
7.501 194 n. 11	7.660 193 n. 6
7.504 199–202	7.661.3 166 n. 69
7.506 199–200, 205–6, 208 and n. 38	7.662 89 n. 18
7.517 89, 90 n. 20, 92, 183 n. 37, 188 n. 69	7.665 196
7.518 94	7.677 1 n. 3, 158
7.519 183 n. 37	7.678 157–8, 171
7.520 194 n. 9	7.679 158
7.521 148	7.699 62 n. 53
7.522 20, 182	7.702 199 n. 18
	7.707 99
	7.708 99

Book 7 (cont.)

7.715 111–13, 193 n. 6, 204 n. 34
 7.718 90 n. 21, 96 n. 48
 7.722 165–6, 193 n. 6
 7.724 163
 7.724.3 174
 7.724.3–4 155, 171, 173
 7.725 89 n. 14
 7.741 277 n. 25

Book 8

8.129 190
 8.189.1 190 n. 83
 8.206 190 n. 83
 8.249.1–2 190 n. 83

Book 9

9.10 198 n. 16
 9.10.1–2 198 n. 17
 9.14 57–8, 61 and table 4.1, 198
 9.14.7–8 62 n. 50
 9.22 93
 9.24 80, 90 n. 21
 9.25 68 n. 6, 99 n. 58
 9.43 63 n. 58, 116–17, 277 n. 26
 9.46 93 n. 32
 9.48 249–50
 9.56 206–7, 208 n. 38
 9.64 99
 9.73 299, 301
 9.86 93 n. 31
 9.92 116–17
 9.94 198 n. 16
 9.114 93 n. 32
 9.122 63 n. 58
 9.127 5
 9.149 92–3
 9.157 245
 9.161 99
 9.168 324
 9.171 324
 9.173 324
 9.175 324
 9.180 266 n. 72, 331–5
 9.181 266 n. 72, 331–4
 9.181.1 325 n. 4
 9.182 266 n. 72, 331–4
 9.183 266 n. 72, 331–6
 9.191 82
 9.196 77–8
 9.197 77–8
 9.215–312 55 n. 28
 9.217 61 and table 4.1
 9.218 61 table 4.1
 9.219 61 and table 4.1
 9.220 61 table 4.1

9.221 61 and table 4.1
 9.222 60, 61 and table 4.1, 62, 197–8
 9.223 60, 61 and table 4.1, 62
 9.224 61 and table 4.1
 9.225 61 and table 4.1, 63 n. 58
 9.226 61 and table 4.1, 63 n. 58
 9.227 57–8, 61 and table 4.1, 198 n. 16
 9.227.7–8 62 n. 50
 9.228 93 n. 32
 9.229 63 n. 58
 9.230 63 n. 58
 9.231 63 n. 58
 9.232 63 n. 58
 9.234 63 n. 58
 9.241 264 n. 69
 9.241.4 263 n. 63, 264 n. 66
 9.244 93 n. 31
 9.245 92 n. 29
 9.257 58–9
 9.258 58–9
 9.265 62
 9.267 62 n. 53
 9.286 58 n. 39
 9.292 207
 9.305 116 n. 40
 9.309 92 n. 29
 9.310 93 n. 31
 9.322 24 n. 37
 9.323 24 n. 37
 9.332 260 n. 52
 9.338 94–5
 9.340 218, 222
 9.342.1–2 2 n. 6
 9.343 63 n. 58
 9.358 68–70, 75, 303 n. 70
 9.369 2 n. 6
 9.379 5
 9.385 80
 9.403 63 n. 58
 9.404 63 n. 58
 9.406 63 n. 58
 9.407 92 n. 29
 9.409 100 n. 63
 9.420.3 263
 9.428 114 n. 37
 9.432 94
 9.433 94–5
 9.434 74 n. 30
 9.437 94–5
 9.441 336–8
 9.506 66–7, 69, 82
 9.507 68, 70, 99
 9.507.3 69
 9.518 86 n. 6
 9.519 86 n. 6
 9.528 326–7

9.545 113–15, 117
 9.556 95
 9.558 95
 9.559 98 n. 56, 111–13
 9.565 222 n. 32
 9.566 222 n. 32
 9.572 75 n. 33
 9.583 81–2
 9.641 281 n. 41
 9.663 343–5, 349
 9.664 343–6, 349
 9.665 343–4, 346–9
 9.666 343 n. 17, 348
 9.667 343–4, 348–9
 9.668 343 n. 17
 9.669 343 n. 17
 9.698 343 n. 16
 9.704 174
 9.713 7, 25 n. 39
 9.714 7, 25 n. 39
 9.715 7, 25 n. 39
 9.716 7, 25 n. 39
 9.717 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 9.718 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 9.719 7, 25 n. 39
 9.720 7, 25 n. 39
 9.721 7, 25 n. 39
 9.721a 7, 25 n. 39
 9.722 7, 25 n. 39
 9.723 7, 25 n. 39
 9.724 7, 25
 9.725 7, 25 n. 39
 9.726 7, 25 n. 39, 310 n. 14
 9.727 7, 25 n. 39
 9.728 7, 25 n. 39
 9.729 7, 25 n. 39
 9.730 7, 25 n. 39
 9.731 7, 25 n. 39
 9.732 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 9.733 7, 25 n. 39
 9.734 7, 25 n. 39
 9.735 7, 25 n. 39
 9.736 7, 25 n. 39
 9.737 7, 25 n. 39
 9.738 7, 25 n. 39
 9.739 7, 25 n. 39
 9.740 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 9.741 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 9.742 7, 25 n. 39, 62 n. 54
 9.773 266 n. 72, 329–31,
 335 n. 42
 9.793 25 n. 39
 9.794 25 n. 39
 9.795 25 n. 39
 9.796 25 n. 39
 9.797 25 n. 39

9.798 25 n. 39
 9.806 350–2
 9.807 350 n. 39
 9.820 343–4, 346
 9.821 343 n. 16

Book 10

10.2 98 n. 56
 10.4 98 n. 56
 10.17 98
 10.20 100
 10.24 98
 10.25 98
 10.53 266 n. 72
 10.82 324
 10.89 324
 10.90 324
 10.100 100 n. 63

Book 11

11.12 86 n. 6
 11.20 115–16
 11.20.2 317 n. 38
 11.23 63 n. 60, 116 n. 40
 11.24 63 n. 60, 99, 114 n. 37
 11.35 89
 11.41 298 n. 51
 11.44 108–10, 113–15, 117
 11.45 63 n. 58
 11.46 63 n. 58
 11.50 298–9
 11.52 239 n. 12
 11.54 330 n. 27
 11.69 130 n. 43
 11.71 260 n. 50
 11.73 260 n. 50
 11.75 309 n. 12
 11.88 259
 11.102 311–12, 315, 317–19
 11.132 189 n. 79
 11.133 189 n. 79
 11.134 189 n. 79
 11.135 189 n. 79
 11.136 189 n. 79
 11.137 144 n. 23, 189 n. 79
 11.149 309 n. 12
 11.151 309 n. 12
 11.158 62 n. 55, 294–5
 11.168 100 n. 63
 11.184 339–42, 352
 11.185 342 n. 11
 11.195 218, 222–3
 11.198 342 n. 13
 11.201 317–19
 11.211 309 n. 12
 11.213 309

Book 11 (*cont.*)

11.215 309–10
 11.224 319
 11.226 209 n. 40
 11.233 309 n. 12
 11.250 310–11
 11.260 130 n. 43
 11.308 317 n. 37
 11.312.4 188–9
 11.322.2 317 n. 38
 11.328 259
 11.330 259 nn. 44 and 46
 11.335 277 n. 25
 11.337 130 n. 43
 11.345 203 n. 29, 289 n. 3
 11.347.2 317 n. 38
 11.350 342 n. 13
 11.352 290 n. 13, 342 n. 13
 11.354 290 n. 13, 292 n. 19, 304 n. 77, 342
 11.362 222 n. 32
 11.365 342 n. 13
 11.366 342 n. 13
 11.367 342 n. 13
 11.368 342 n. 13
 11.369 342 n. 13
 11.370 342 n. 13
 11.372 342 n. 13
 11.374 342 n. 13
 11.375 342 n. 13
 11.376 342 n. 13
 11.378 324
 11.379 342 n. 13
 11.380 342 n. 13
 11.382 342 n. 13
 11.407 259
 11.416 260

Book 12

12.1 74 n. 33
 12.2 74 n. 33
 12.20 259
 12.20.2 267 n. 76
 12.23 96
 12.37 259
 12.37.2 245 n. 28
 12.43 117, 239
 12.46 5
 12.52 98
 12.65 259
 12.69 259
 12.101 242 n. 22
 12.116 88 n. 12
 12.117 88 n. 12, 252 n. 14
 12.118 95, 299 n. 52

12.120 298 n. 51
 12.153 96
 12.158.3 166 n. 69
 12.167 96
 12.171 98
 12.207 319
 12.239 256 n. 31, 259 n. 50, 264 n. 67
 12.257 75

Book 13

13.10 98
 13.12 196

Book 14

14.6 125 n. 25
 14.9 124, 125 n. 25
 14.16 130 n. 45
 14.23 121 n. 10
 14.25 126 n. 28
 14.26 121 n. 10
 14.27 126 n. 28
 14.28 121
 14.30 121 n. 10
 14.31 130–1
 14.32 126
 14.36 121 n. 10
 14.38 126 n. 28
 14.47 121 n. 10
 14.52 121 n. 10
 14.59 126 n. 28
 14.64 132
 14.101 133
 14.105 125 n. 25, 128, 130
 14.106 5 n. 34, 128 n. 36

Book 15

15.1 77
 15.4 170 n. 91
 15.5 170 n. 91
 15.6 170 n. 91
 15.7 170 n. 91
 15.8 170 n. 91
 15.12 290 n. 13, 292 n. 19
 15.21 77, 130
 15.22 77
 15.23 77
 15.24 77
 15.25 77
 15.26 77
 15.27 77
 15.30 204 n. 30
 15.37 69–70, 79 n. 50
 15.40 79
 15.40.6–9 202 n. 21

Anthologia Planudea

1	166	197	242
5	86 n. 6	198	57, 242
23	22 n. 19	199	57, 242
31	203 n. 25, 302 n. 68	199. 7	236
46	286	201	242 n. 23
62	284–5	202	242 n. 23
63	284–5	207	242 n. 23, 328
68	26 n. 45, 182 n. 34, 309 n. 11	214	245 n. 29
68.2	309 n. 11	215	245 n. 29
72	281 n. 41	221	278–9, 281–2, 285
83.1–2	310 n. 14	222	277, 279
84.1	310	223	277 n. 27, 278–9,
95	166 n. 74	281–2,	285
117	277, 279	226	95
118	278, 282, 285	232	277, 279
119	5, 274–5	263	277 n. 27
159.1	318 n. 39	275	26
160.4	318 n. 39, 319	282	331 n. 29
162	319	285	269 n. 84
162.2	318 n. 39	291	94
163	318 n. 39	298	80
165	58 n. 39, 318	300	80
166	58 n. 39	302	80
168	318 n. 39	304	80
175.2	309 n. 11	307	90 n. 21
178.5–6	318	314	342 n. 13
179.2	318 n. 39	318	309 n. 12
180.5–6	318	325	290 n. 13, 304 n. 77
181.5–6	318	326	304 n. 77
182.8–9	318–19	327	292 n. 19
194	329 n. 19	333	62 n. 55
195	242–3	334	62 n. 55
196	242, 328 n. 18	352.1	309 n. 11